DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 375 RC 016 915

TITLE	The Economic Development of West Virginia through Education: Symposium Proceedings and Recommendations (White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, August 6-7, 1986).
INSTITUTION	Academy for Educational Development, Inc., New York, N.Y.; West Virginia Roundtable Inc.
SPONS AGENCY	Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, Pittsburgh, Pa.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-89492-063-4
PUB DATE	Apr 87
NOTE	122p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Academy for Educational Development, 1255 23rd St., N.W., Washington, DC 20037 (ISBN-0-89492-063-4, charge for shipping only).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Cost Effectiveness; Decentralization; Dropouts; *Economic Development; *Educational Change; Educational Development; *Educational Legislation; Education Work Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; *Employment Potential; Literacy; Management Development; Public Schools; *School Business Relationship; *Teacher Education; Teacher Salaries; Teacher Shortage
IDENTIFIERS	*West Virginia

ABSTRACT

West Virginia's leaders--elected officials, business leaders, administrators of benevolence funding--attended the symposium held by the Education Task Force of West Virginia. Recommendations resulting from the symposium were: (1) to urge and support plans that focus on the individual student as the object of all reform efforts; (2) to support programs that develop a more cost effective education system; (3) to encourage teacher development at pre-service and in-service levels across the state; (4) to endorse and support the implementation of the West Virginia Board of Education's "1990 Targets for Public Education"; and (5) to support the efforts of the West Virginia Education Fund to establish and develop greater cooperation between the community, particularly the business community, and the public schools. This proceedings contains a summary, recommendations, and transcripts of speeches and discussions. Titles and speakers include: "Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools" (O. Butler); "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century" (L. Branscomb): "What a State Can Do To Improve Education" (W. Godwin); "Keynote Speech" (Arch A. Moore, Jr., Governor of West Virginia); "Recommendations for No-Cost Reforms" (a special question-response session); "Current State Efforts To Improve Education" (D. Doyle); "The Press and Education Reform" (E. Fiske); and "Relationship of the Public Schools to Business" (R. Schwartz). The appendices include a list of participants and a copy of the program. (KS)

ED302375

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA THROUGH EDUCATION

Symposium Proceedings
and Recommendations
August 6-7, 1986

TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION,
WEST VIRGINIA ROUNDTABLE, INC.
AND THE CLAUDE WORTHINGTON
BENEDUM FOUNDATION

AED

Academy for Educational Development

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marjorie Webster

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC 016915

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA THROUGH EDUCATION

Symposium Proceedings
and Recommendations
August 6-7, 1986

TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION,
WEST VIRGINIA ROUNDTABLE, INC.
AND THE CLAUDE WORTHINGTON
BENEDUM FOUNDATION

AED
Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
680 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10019

April, 1987

Copyright © by Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
ISBN 0-89492-063-4 Printed in U.S.A. April, 1987

Table of Contents

FOREWORD 5

I. SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS 9

II. RECOMMENDATIONS 17

III. SYMPOSIUM I:
   Greetings and Goals 21
   Speakers:
   Owen B. Butler 23
   Lewis M. Branscomb 31
   Winfred Godwin 41
   Discussion 45

IV. KEYNOTE SPEAKER — Governor Arch A. Moore, Jr. 62

V. SPECIAL SESSION:
   Recommendations for No-Cost Reforms 69

VI. SYMPOSIUM II:
   Speakers:
   Dennis P. Doyle 89
   Edward Fiske 95
   Robert Schwartz 102
   Discussion 107

VII. CLOSING REMARKS AND CONCLUSIONS 119

APPENDICES 120

A. Participant List 120

B. Program 126

Foreword

Foreword to the West Virginia Roundtable Symposium Report

Crisis often holds within itself a hidden opportunity. The challenge of building and re-orienting West Virginia's educational system for the information age, and beyond, is in a sense a crisis, and in another very important sense a golden opportunity to effect real and critically necessary change through concerted action. The strength of the group we gathered at this symposium bespeaks a powerful commitment on the part of this state to education.

West Virginia's leaders—elected officials, business leaders, administrators of benevolence funding—came to the Symposium at the Greenbrier with a shared concern for education. The idea was to hammer out a consensus leading to a plan of action, to give clear form to our commitment to an investment in education, and to settle upon ways in which that investment can be planned, funded and acted upon. The Summary and Recommendations of this report represent a set of guiding principles and the groundwork for educational policy in this state.

Again and again in this report, you will find the problem reduced to its basic dimensions: education is the key to developing this state's human resources. Employable, productive young people are the future of the state; they are, in today's changing economy, what this state's natural resources were in a bygone era. Improved public schools mean a new wealth in our most important resource — keeping our young people in West Virginia through the transition from school to work will be at once the greatest attraction for business and the surest sign of our success.

It is clear that we came to this Symposium with the highest of intentions and no lack of good ideas, as is often the case when we speak of improving our schools. What made this gathering special, and what puts substance into this report, is the immediacy of the issue and the response to it. We convened the committed business interests and the legislative influence to put our fine ideals and good intentions to work, to produce viable recommendations to be translated into action. The imperative behind the consensus and determination of this group is the recognition of education as the most direct means for turning crisis into renewal.

The importance of this gathering at once makes clear the gravity of our mission and the grounds for optimism. The Symposium at the Greenbrier accomplished the unprecedented, assembling the most powerful people and interests in the state in one place for the express and singular purpose of improving the lives of West Virginia's people by improving their schools. The list of speakers is indeed an illustrious roll of names in education, in West Virginia, in government; the roster of those in attendance contains enough energy and influence to give dynamic form to their mandate — economic renewal through education reform.

The success of the *Symposium on Economic Development Through Education*, and the enthusiasm generated by the proceedings can be attributed to many factors: the importance of the issues being addressed, the dedication of those participating, the need and desire of the State of West Virginia to improve its educational system, and the commitment of the Legislature to seriously investigate the possibility of reform. But there is a second list of reasons — the individuals and organizations responsible for creating, organizing and conducting the Symposium, without whom this wonderful forum would never have come to be. I would like to take this opportunity to gratefully acknowledge their participation and support, and to extend appreciation on behalf of all who came to the Greenbrier in hopeful anticipation, and who left with a renewed sense of purpose and vigor for improving the education of West Virginia's students.

Governor Arch A. Moore, Jr., whose active participation and presence underscored the significance of the symposium and encouraged all West Virginians.

Education Task Force of the West Virginia Roundtable, for their foresight and initiative in implementing the symposium.

West Virginia Roundtable, including **Thomas C. Burns** and **the Executive Committee** for their support throughout the planning stages of the symposium and the proceedings.

Madeleine Hemmings, President of the West Virginia Roundtable, and her assistant, **Kathleen Steska,** for their tireless work on behalf of the Roundtable in planning and coordinating the symposium.

Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, not only for the generous grant which made the symposium possible, but for the guidance and advice of Foundation Executive Vice President **Paul R. Jenkins,** whose active and enthusiastic involvement was instrumental in the success of the symposium, and who also recommended the services of:

The Academy for Educational Development. AED President **Dr. Alvin C. Eurich** was, in large part, responsible for securing the participation of many of the distinguished guest speakers, and he provided wise counsel and vision throughout the planning period. Academy Vice President **Sharon L. Franz,** and her assistant **Melody Brooks,** were valuable assets to the planning and coordination of the symposium, and continued to lend assistance throughout the proceedings and the publication of this document.

The Greenbrier, whose hospitality and in-kind support ensured the success of the symposium, and to **William Pitt, III,** whose services as host extended well beyond the expected into the extraordinary.

Hulett C. Smith
Chairman
West Virginia Roundtable Task Force on Education

I. Summary of the Proceedings

The West Virginia Roundtable Symposium:
The Economic Development of West Virginia Through Education

Summary of the Proceedings

Education and the Economy

On August 6-7, 1986, the Education Task Force of the West Virginia Roundtable held a Symposium at the Greenbrier, which brought together top public and private leaders of West Virginia to discuss and promote the development of a structure and process for the state's economic renewal through education. The goal of the Symposium was to inspire West Virginia's elected officials with a commitment to an investment in public education today to assure future jobs in the state. The leading officials of the state convened to hear eminent speakers discuss the need to prepare West Virginians with the skills to steer the state's economy on a successful course through the Information Age. To do this, immediate improvements are needed at every level of education but especially in the elementary and secondary schools, where basic skills essential to productive citizens are developed. While the Symposium convened leading representatives from business, industry and other private sector organizations, there was consensus that, in the long run, the main impetus in both leadership and funding must come from State Government.

In the opinion of Dennis Doyle of the Hudson Institute, the responsibility for pushing forward educational reform has fallen on the shoulders of state governors, legislators and educators, almost by default. Because of a static federal role in shaping and financing education, now and for the foreseeable future, because of an increased demand to "retool" the education system to address the needs of a changing economy, and because of an increased competence of state governments to deal with "large, complex, and stormy problems," states have inherited the task of designing and implementing profoundly new reforms. The business community has a large stake in the success of these reforms, whatever shape they may take, and can contribute by providing political and financial support, managerial expertise, direction and impetus. This will require developing a range of business and school partnerships. All current research suggests that such partnerships will benefit both businesses and schools and will generate renewed economic vitality within the states.

West Virginia, today, faces the transition from a more strictly rural orientation and dependence on a few, key natural resources, to a new economic era of service, knowledge, and information industries. Since the school system was first created almost a century ago, there have been no major changes in a structure designed to serve an essentially agrarian economy. Edward Fiske, Education Editor for *The New York Times*, described the challenge facing education reformers. Simply put, the massive restructuring of the economy now occurring is forcing a similarly far-reaching restructuring of the educational system. The Governor, the Legislature, and educators, working closely with business leaders, must meet this challenge on a comprehensive front. Piecemeal reforms and "cosmetic" changes will not be sufficient to supply the kind of quality employee who will be needed in the Information Age.

Common Interests of Business and Education

Owen Butler, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Business and the Schools of the Committee for Economic Development, described research undertaken to determine whether "good business management principles" could be applied to the operation of schools. This research resulted in 67 unanimously endorsed recommendations for improving the performance of schools, which are published in the monograph *Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools*.

The interests of the business and education communities overlap in four distinct areas: employability, investment, business-school partnerships, and the teacher work force.

According to responses of major corporate executives and personnel departments, there are two, "and only two," essentials for employability which the schools must instill. These are literacy and acceptable work habits. Any young person who has both traits is employable; any who lacks either trait is not, and probably will not be employed. These findings should be underscored as school priorities to ensure that graduates may be profitably employed. Any school program which permits students to advance without acquiring literacy is "defrauding those students." As well, it is the responsibility of principals to provide an environment for students in which they are adequately supervised, but also are able to learn the skill of "self-supervision," which is indispensable.

Researchers looked at a range of school programs to determine whether outcomes could be measured in a similar manner to business investments. Although several types of programs, such as residential training in literacy, work habits, and work skills, turned an obvious "profit" in terms of individual productivity for every dollar spent, one program stood out. Twenty years of testing demonstrates that providing preschool education for three-year-olds from disadvantaged families pays four dollars back for every one dollar invested, plus interest.

These results suggest that attitudes toward "spending" money on education should be reevaluated in terms of the costs of failure. Properly targeted investments in education can reap measurable social and financial rewards.

Research evidence suggests that principals are a key factor in delivering excellent school outcomes. The best principals display strong managerial skills. However, managerial skills are not typically a requisite for the position. Business people can bring their vast experience to bear on this problem through such programs as Adopt-a-Principal, in which a business tutors a local school principal in the skills of management, motivation and evaluation. Two other effective arrangements are Adopt-a-School and Partnerships in Education, in which businesses become involved in implementing reform in specific schools. This requires looking at administrative structures and school programs to suggest more efficient techniques of delivery, and for providing leadership and political support for change.

Robert Schwartz, Executive Director of the *Boston Compact*, described the highly successful implementation of a business-school partnership designed to guarantee entry-level jobs for graduates of Boston's high schools. In a six-month series of negotiations between chief executive officers with major corporations in the city and the Superintendent of Schools, an agreement was formalized with measurable goals: job goals on the business side; and school improvement goals on the school side. School goals were to improve attendance, improve basic skills performance on standardized tests, improve preparation for employment, and reduce the dropout rate. After four years, businesses are providing 1000 new positions per year for graduates, and schools record progress in three out of the four goals. It was determined that the goal of reducing the dropout rate was beyond the reach of any single program.

Teacher Education

Speakers addressed the problems of attracting and keeping enough skilled teachers to achieve the goals of education reform once they have been formulated, and stressed that "education takes place in the classroom." There was strong agreement that the only way to make teaching more competitive with other businesses, and — in the special case of West Virginia — with other states that are "draining away qualified manpower," is to pay more money. It is simple economics. Increasing standards for teachers will only aggravate shortages unless wages are more competitive. As well, ways should be developed to reward teacher excellence through incentive pay and bonuses.

These suggestions, and others relating to restructuring the teaching profession as a whole, were emphasized by Lewis Branscomb, Chairman of the Carnegie Corporation Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, in his presentation of the recommendations published in *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.*

Teacher shortages are exacerbated by population "booms" and "busts." When student populations were in decline, fewer teaching positions were open to young adults. Therefore, those young adults sought out other occupations, depleting teacher ranks. In addition, more career options have opened up for young women, the traditional teacher labor pool. In 1969, 36 percent of college freshmen women expected to go into teaching, while, fifteen years later, this number had declined to eight percent, with 21 percent expecting careers in business. Alternatives to teaching have reduced the supply of new science and mathematics teachers to a critical level, and for minority teachers, the situation is even worse.

According to the Carnegie report, there are two ways to deal with this supply-demand imbalance. The first option is for school districts to lower standards; states can issue temporary licenses and allow more teachers to teach out of subject. With this approach, the best teachers will become increasingly dispirited and leave the profession in accelerating numbers, more academically accomplished students entering college will seek other careers, and the quality of education will continue to decline as vacant positions are filled by drawing on larger numbers from the least qualified pool of applicants.

The alternative, preferred strategy offered by the Carnegie report, is to:

- raise standards for teachers
- strengthen their educational preparation;
- revamp their compensation system;
- restructure the schools to make teaching more effective, productive, and rewarding; and
- encourage communities to set goals for school performance to which teachers will commit and for which they agree to be accountable.

While raising standards in the face of an impending shortage may, at first, appear counter-productive, it may well be the only way to attract a sufficient number of qualified people into teaching. The professional environment in the schools must be altered to make teaching more attractive.

The Carnegie report proposes several responses, which were considered in depth by Roundtable participants. These include establishing a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, restructuring the school faculty, and allowing individual teachers more autonomy.

The report recommends phasing out the undergraduate baccalaureate degree in education and opening the profession to graduates in all arts and sciences. Candidates would then be required to take a Master in Teaching degree. Compensation should be based on the level of Board certification, the degree of responsibility in the school, experience, and performance against agreed objectives. Salary should be made competitive with other careers requiring comparable education.

A central thesis of the Carnegie Task Force report is that a reform movement that merely restores the school system "to the 1950's" will not prepare students for participation in an information-intensive economy. Reformers must think in terms of a radical departure from past structures and programs. Although obstacles to implementation are formidable, the "price of ignorance" is too high. These "radical" reforms could be financed partially by reallocating resources from "top heavy" administrative structures, and from remedial and other "stopgap" programs, which would become increasingly unnecessary as the quality of teaching improved. This should require no more than the same fraction of the GNP that education has historically enjoyed, but, nevertheless, translates into a considerable "lump sum" of 47 billion dollars, nationwide.

Local School Improvement

Several speakers addressed the issue of over-regulation and the need to increase opportunities for schools to move at their own pace, while remaining accountable to established educational achievement standards. It was suggested that ways be investigated to increase flexibility and establish the kinds of regulation which would support local school improvement by allowing schools to:

- define what students must acquire from their schooling to be ready for the job market, and
- turn principals and teachers "loose" to teach in the most effective and productive manner they can devise, so long as standards are met.

Research has demonstrated that parochial schools and select public schools which are organized and operated with the autonomy of private schools, do a better job with low-income and minority students than typical public schools. Most regulations are promulgated by legislatures to address the shortcomings of the bottom ten or fifteen counties of the state. Removing restrictions and regulations from those schools which already meet or exceed established standards, would allow flexibility and encourage innovation.

In the course of discussion, a pilot program was proposed to begin deregulation of West Virginia schools. It was suggested that the best school districts in the state be encouraged to compete for participation in the pilot program, and that those deemed "most likely to succeed" be enrolled. The Legislature would then "pass legislation to remove all regulations" for these districts. Participating districts would be required to maintain or exceed all performance indicators now in use. Legislators agreed to look at this proposal jointly with the State School Board.

The Governor's Challenge

The Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Arch A. Moore, Jr., addressed Roundtable members and invited guests. He described the many educational conferences and activities occurring around the state that promised to inaugurate, not a Year of Education, but a Decade of Educational Reform for the State of West Virginia. He proposed that the coming legislative session be truly devoted to the consideration of educational reforms. Money, he suggested, would be available to implement reform, however, every effort must be made to ensure that "dollars attack the problem at hand," not merely go for more of the same: "We must dare to be different."

Economic development hinges totally on improving the quality of education, on reforming the "broad face and broad menu of education." Accomplishing this task will require legislators, business leaders, and educators to put aside divisive self-interest and focus on the job at hand. "Every one of us owes our position and the opportunities we have had to the education we received. We owe the same consideration to future generations."

The Governor stated:

> "Any time you pull up lame in the field of education, you have lost the momentum. The competition in the field of education is more intense than among any one of the industries represented here, that may be considered adversaries of one another . . . . Out of this collective gathering, and certainly from the leadership of the Legislature that is present, we can summon, in my judgment, the type of daring it is going to take to move in the education field."

A challenge was given to establish concrete goals for the future of education in West Virginia and for leaders to make a public commitment to those goals before ending the Symposium.

The Roundtable Response

In response to the Governor's challenge, a special session was convened for the following morning to discuss the recommendations contained in the Committee on Economic Development's report *Investing in Our Children*. Educational priorities for high schools of literacy and employability were confirmed and commitments were made in many important areas.

The State School Superintendent reconfirmed a commitment to look jointly with legislators at ways of deregulating school districts that were presently meeting or exceeding current standards. The Chairman of Education in the House agreed to begin an interim process that would develop legislation to address this issue.

The State School Superintendent agreed to implement an honors diploma for academically superior students graduating throughout the state "as soon as it is literally possible to take care of it."

The State School Superintendent agreed to push forward 1990 goals of increasing pay and compensation for teachers in the state of West Virginia.

All parties agreed to back State Board initiatives to make literacy a requisite for student enrollment in vocational education programs.

All parties agreed to support an initiative to provide preschool education for the state's three- and four-year-olds.

Business leaders offered to support and participate more fully in school-business partnerships, such as Adopt-a-School, Adopt-a-Principal, Partnerships in Education, and Teacher Mini-Grant programs. School Board goals suggest that, by 1990, every school in West Virginia have a business partner.

A pilot program was proposed to make better use of business, county, and community resources to support education reform. It was suggested that, rather than depending solely on educators to define educational priorities, a coalition of local government, business, and school leaders could be convened to develop a comprehensive county or regional plan. Emphasis would be placed on addressing the problems of dropout, at-risk students, and transition from school to the work place. Participants would be required to identify the resources they could bring to bear on these problems, how they plan to use existing resources, and define the role they intend to play in the county-wide process. Individual schools within the jurisdiction would then be allowed to compete to translate goals into school-specific programs. These innovations might be funded through a state-wide mechanism for matching private and state monies.

Symposium participants agreed to look at this and other proposals for implementing reform at the local and regional levels and for strengthening local autonomy.

Conclusion

Participants in the Symposium expressed the opinion that it was indeed a historic occasion, marking the first meeting devoted to education reform in recent history to attract such a large and distinguished group of legislators, government administrators and business leaders. Important new research in the field of education was aired and discussed, a direction and a purpose decided upon, and commitments made. The Symposium sought to underscore the vital link between the quality of education and economic development, and in this it succeeded.

According to Winfred Godwin, President of the Southern Regional Education Board, a consensus is emerging in nearly every state that:

- abundant natural resources do not, in themselves, ensure economic prosperity; states are increasingly cognizant of the need to develop their human resources;
- improving education will require an all-out, comprehensive effort on the part of policy makers; radical structural changes must be considered, rather than attempting "piecemeal" reforms; and
- the fundamental changes needed will require extraordinary and concerted actions by governments, businesses, educators, and private citizens, pooling resources and working together.

While recognizing that many formidable political and economic obstacles must be overcome, participants in the Roundtable Symposium departed with a sense that the process has, indeed, begun in West Virginia.

II. Recommendations

Introduction

The individual student must be the object of any education reform. The current efforts of the Education Task Force of the West Virginia Roundtable are focused on supporting a quality public school system which will assure good citizenship and enrich the quality of each student's life. Life quality is intrinsically tied to equipping students with those skills and attitudes that will permit them to compete successfully in a changing economic environment. The Task Force believes that quality education in West Virginia means jobs. Establishing such a system requires time, energy and commitment from all sectors of society. There are no quick and easy answers. To be successful, statewide reform efforts must incorporate both short term strategies and long range plans.

There has never been a better time to begin the process of reforming West Virginia's schools. Rather than dwell on what was not done in the past, this is the time for a new beginning. This is the time to draw together the best and most able of West Virginia leaders to support the improvement of the public schools. However, it is necessary to understand the current strengths and weaknesses of the West Virginia schools if we are to develop the best plans for the future.

The Education Task Force has set forth the following recommendations with two primary purposes: to improve the quality of education of students in West Virginia, and to increase the efficiency of the public schools. While educational reform will ultimately require additional dollars, many of the recommendations suggest reallocation of existing funding in more cost effective and productive ways.

The West Virginia Roundtable is eager and willing to support the work and investment of West Virginia officials charged with the improvement of public schools throughout this new period of reform. The Roundtable will encourage and support needed changes such as those listed in the following recommendations.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations of the Education Task Force of the West Virginia Roundtable:

1. **Urge and support plans that focus on the individual student as the object of all reform efforts:**
   —encourage the creation of individual learning goals for each student in West Virginia public schools and hold the schools and their faculties accountable for the achievement of those goals;

—support plans that encourage the development of student mastery of basic skills, critical thinking and problem-solving abilities;
—encourage plans that equip students with appropriate work habits;
—encourage the development of alternative assessment measures to reduce dependence on standardized test scores as a measure of success; and
—support programs that create accountability systems which measure the progress of individual students.

2. **Support programs that develop a more cost effective education system:**
   —encourage programs that conduct a review and assessment of the administrative structure and cost of the West Virginia schools;
   —encourage the expansion of leadership training institutes for principals and other administrators;
   —stress the need to reform the administrative structure of the public school system to make it more efficient and less costly, e.g., through regionalization of services to minimize duplication;
   —stress the need to shift more responsibility to teachers for curriculum development and setting academic standards, as well as the burden of accountability for achieving those standards;
   —encourage legislation to increase the opportunities for pre-school education;
   —encourage more extensive and effective use of modern educational technology; and
   —support plans that increase the number of paraprofessionals, teachers' aides and counselors at all levels.
3. **Encourage teacher development at pre-service and in-service levels across the state:**
   —provide incentives to attract highly qualified people into the teaching profession;
   —seriously reevaluate the system of providing teacher education, including moving formal teacher education courses to the graduate level and opening the teaching profession to all arts and science graduates;
   —encourage the review and adaptation of the recommendations of the Carnegie Report on the Future of Teaching to schools in West Virginia; and
   —encourage the establishment of classroom autonomy, which frees teachers from restrictive regulations and enables them to work with individual students on individual goals.
4. **Endorse and support the implementation of the West Virginia Board of Education's "1990 Targets for Public Education."**
5. **Support the efforts of the West Virginia Education Fund to establish and develop greater cooperation between the community, particularly the business community, and the public**

schools through such efforts as "Partnerships in Education," "Mini-Grants for Teachers," programs to identify and recognize excellence in teaching, and programs which encourage more public school students to graduate from high school and take advantage of higher educational opportunities.

Continuing Responsibilities of the Education Task Force

Communities, in particular the business community, have a real stake in the quality of their public schools and resources to contribute toward improving that quality. With this in mind, the Education Task Force of the West Virginia Roundtable should:

- encourage and aid the collection of data about West Virginia's public education system;
- monitor current reform efforts across the state; and
- increase its understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the West Virginia educational system and serve as an information source to the West Virginia Roundtable.

Responsibility of the West Virginia Roundtable

- Maintain and strengthen its contact with the West Virginia political system to assist in the enactment of education reform.

III. Symposium I

Greetings and Goals of the Symposium

Thomas C. Burns
Chairman
West Virginia Roundtable, Inc.

I want to welcome you to the *Symposium on Economic Development through Education*. It is the first time in recent history that such a large and distinguished group of state legislators have met with business leaders to focus and to work on a problem of great importance to the future of West Virginia.

Your presence indicates that you are dedicated to improving the quality of education in West Virginia. You understand the vital link between education and the economy. Because of your commitment and of your willingness to work together—business leaders, state legislators, and educators—this Symposium is bound to be a success.

These two days are dedicated to studying these problems—hopefully, cooperatively and certainly comprehensively. We'll look at some long-term solutions rather than isolated stopgap measures. We certainly have distinguished guests to share their ideas and their experiences with us. We'll be able to discuss how West Virginia is similar to some of the other states throughout our country, and also we'll discuss some of the special requirements in West Virginia. We will have panel discussions. But you, too will have ample time to share your views during the discussions which will follow the presentations; and also informally throughout the period of the conference. I urge you to bring up your concerns, your ideas that influence and are affected by your businesses and your constituents.

Hulett C. Smith
Former Governor of West Virginia
Chairman, Roundtable Task Force on Education

Today is a beginning. We are not going to talk about the past. We're going to try together to reach a consensus and to recognize more fully that the time has come, as this nation and the world enter an information age, when the human mind is the most valuable form of capital. We recognize that the economic vitality of West Virginia has been threatened by the loss of its natural resources, and now is threatened by the drain of its human resources as people move away. It is time now to take the bold steps that are necessary to improve the quality of life in West Virginia, primarily through improving the quality of the education of its citizens.

The Roundtable Task Force on Education was formed some time ago when we discussed the needs of education, and the direct relationship of quality education and just plain economics. And we named our program at that time — Quality Education Means Jobs. The Roundtable has been established to develop means for providing more employment for the people of West Virginia. The Task Force is composed of members of the Roundtable, educators, and leaders in business. We met to determine what we could do to bring the business leadership together with the political leadership of our state, to recognize that education was the key to the future of West Virginia.

There are statistics I could give you with which you are probably more familiar than I am — the ranking of our state in literacy, the number of dropouts in the school system, and the problems that have been faced on local levels. The common laborer, once the highest classification of employment in this nation, has now dropped to a very minor role. In fact, Secretary Block has recently said that the work of a common laborer will be replaced by machines by the first part of the next century. It may be earlier than that. But information and knowledge jobs have increased. Service jobs have increased, and the only way the people can get those jobs is to be educated.

This conference is the beginning. We hope to inspire you or, together, to be inspired to the commitment that a long-range investment in education now will mean jobs in West Virginia in the future. It is my hope that this meeting of top public and private leaders of West Virginia will begin a process and a structure for the economic renewal of West Virginia through education. Those are our goals. What we do with them is up to us.

I am asking you today to listen to the leaders in educational development throughout the nation that are our guests, and to try to envision a West Virginia with a quality educational system, a West Virginia with the literacy and the educational rates of Japan. Our whole nation could strive for that. There is no reason we can't do it. We just need the commitment to a better West Virginia through better education.

Symposium I: Speakers

Investing in Our Children:
Business and the Public Schools

Owen B. Butler
Chairman of the Board (ret.),
Proctor & Gamble, Co.
Chairman
Subcommittee on Business and the Schools,
Committee for Economic Development

Developing Human Resources

All of us are talking about the development of human resources as the key to future productivity and prosperity, as though that has only become true with the dawning of the so-called "age of information." I submit that it has been true a lot longer than that. As a matter of fact, I submit that the reason the American economy became supreme in the world in the late 19th and early 20th centuries is that, while Europe was educating its aristocrats, America was the one major country that was educating all of its people, and doing everything it could to develop its human resources.

I submit, not as theory but as obvious fact, that Japan has followed this course in the last 40 years, and has moved from bankruptcy to a position of economic strength. This nation totally lacks what economists say are the requirements for productivity. That is, it lacks natural resources, any capital base at the end of World War II, and financial resources. Yet lacking all three of these supposed essential ingredients for prosperity, Japan has moved from bankruptcy to become, at least, the second most powerful economic force in the world. On a per capita basis, Japan is perhaps *the* most powerful, by one simple dedication. That is the dedication to the development of their human resources.

This illustrates why business must have an interest in education, and must not only become involved but stay involved. One of the mistakes we have made in business over the last 50 years is to assume that education could take care of itself and business could take care of itself, and it doesn't work very well. Educators, as critical as they are to the future of our society, don't have their theories tested in the marketplace day by day. They can theorize themselves away from reality, and that is why economists continue to teach that natural resources, capital resources, and financial resources are the key to productivity, when every businessman knows that human resources are what make a business.

To the degree that developing human resources was critical in the last forty years or the last hundred years, this will be more true tomorrow. And will be even more true for a state like West Virginia. The advantage that an abundance of natural resources gave this state in the past is not going to exist in the information age.

A Solution at Hand

The second thing I would urge you to accept is that the solution to the problem is already known. We don't need a lot of meetings to figure out what ought to be done, because so many people have already spent the last five years doing that. I offer you the Committee for Economic Development, as an example. We started in the spring of 1982 to do exactly what you're starting to do, that is, to figure out how business people can point the way to better education. We set out, not to evaluate education, not to bemoan failures, but to look at education and determine specific actions to ensure that children, graduating from our schools ten, twenty, and thirty years from today, will be better equipped for the world—at least from an economic standpoint—than children graduating today. This is the way we run our businesses. We don't dwell on whether we're good or bad, but on how we can get better. How can we be better equipped to compete in the future? The answers we derived are not the answers of a group of businessmen.

Principles for the Report

Our first decision was that the chairmen and presidents of corporations are not themselves experts on education. If they are experts in anything it is on problem-solving, so we set principles for developing our report. Principle number one was to go out and find experts on education, just as we would find experts in our business. We got the President of the Teachers' Union, the Superintendent of Schools from Atlanta, the President of Columbia Teachers College, the Senior Lecturer in Education at Harvard University, the Education President from Stanford, the Chancellor of the State University System of New York, the President of Hunter College, the Chancellor of the State University System of Florida, and the two full-time writers and scholars on education from the American Enterprise Institute. We brought together conservatives, liberals, teachers, taxpayers, board members, superintendents—a cross section—and said, let's look at education and find things we all agree need to be done in order to fix the problem.

The second thing we said was, let's not publish a book of opinions; let's publish a book of facts, a set of recommendations based on research. Let's collect the information, and let the information lead us to conclusions. One thing wrong with education is that too many programs have been implemented because somebody thought they were a good idea without research and testing. Let's not do that. Let's get facts to lead us to conclusions. Let's stick to our knitting — to those areas of education where business ought to be able to make a contribution. Those we define as four.

Four Areas Where Business Can Contribute to Education

Employability. When we say employability what do we mean? What attributes are we talking about? *Investment.* Is education really something on which we spend money? Or is it something in which we invest money with the expectation of a return plus profit? *The Teacher Work Force.* What do we know about personnel management in business that can be translated into better ways to recruit, educate, train, manage, motivate, and compensate the teacher work force? They are the producers of education. *Business-School Partnerships.* What have we learned to date about business-school partnerships? What aspects of business involvement with the education system can be useful if brought together in an encyclopedic form, as a reference book on business-school partnerships?

Out of that study came 67 recommendations. Every one is there with the unanimous endorsement of every member of the committee. We developed information, discussed, learned, and taught each other, until we arrived at a recommendation, one that all—the teachers' union, corporate executives, school board representatives, superintendents, teachers colleges—agreed was the right solution in that area.

Employability

Let me talk about employability. The answer here, like all the answers, is not our opinion. It is the result of a survey — a market research kind of effort — constructed by market research and personnel experts from companies like Proctor and Gamble, A.T.& T., J.C. Penney, and others. It was submitted to all of the Fortune 500 companies, and 3000 independent, mostly small businesses. The answers are consistent and clear.

Our research, incidentally, differs from most of the research done on this subject, most of which is narrow and asks questions about academic skills. But that is not the way employers look at prospective employees. They look at the whole person. They look at all the attributes: social, behavioral, and academic. Our research was designed to get at these other skills and attitudes.

The answer is: there are two and only two essentials for employability. First, there is a set of acceptable work habits, which includes: the willingness to accept responsibility for getting a job done without supervision; the self-discipline to be where one is supposed to be when one is supposed to be there with regularity; and the recognition that individuals have no right to disrupt the work of the group in which they're working, that in the work environment group rights come ahead of individual rights. This is the whole realm of what you might call self-discipline.

The second essential is literacy. It is the ability to use the normal English language fluently in both its written and spoken form.

Any young person who has that set of attributes and behavior patterns, and the skill of literacy, is employable and will almost certainly be employed. Any young person who lacks either of those two is probably unemployed and probably always will be unless he or she acquires those two attributes. All of the pump priming and economy-stimulating programs in the world will not cause those people to be employed.

Let me give you a statistical correlation that, I think, illustrates this point. There are 4.9 million young people in this country between the ages of 16 and 24 who have dropped out of school. Sixty percent of them are illiterate. That is 2.9 million young people, aged 16 to 24, who are not in school and who are not literate. The total unemployment among youths aged 16 to 24 in the United States is 3,300,000, 90 percent of whom are illiterate, and will always be unemployed. They will constitute 75 percent of our prison population, half of our welfare cases, and most of our teenage pregnancies. What this says is: the first things needed to improve education are to insure that principals run a disciplined environment in which children learn acceptable behavior patterns, that teachers insist on acceptable behavior patterns, and that schools demand literacy as the achievement of every student.

I have a cousin in the real estate business, who says that there are three critical things to look at in evaluating property—location, location, and location. I submit that there are ten critical issues in public education—work habits, literacy, literacy, work habits, work habits, literacy, literacy, work habits, work habits, and literacy. That does not mean nothing else matters, but it *does* mean that if you don't get those two essentials then nothing else matters. Once you get those two essentials, the more you can add the better.

And let me broaden literacy to make sure everybody understands. My high school principal told me on the first day of high school, in his address to the incoming freshman class, that during your years in this high school you will learn three languages—a modern European language, the English language, and mathematics. He was dead right. Think about it. No one is literate who cannot talk mathematics. Otherwise, how do you know what half of something is? To the degree that mathematics is part of the English language, that part of mathematics that enables one to communicate ideas is an essential part of literacy, and must be an essential part of your program.

Any school program which permits students to progress without acquiring literacy is defrauding those students. The worst fraud is the program called vocational education which teaches a student a so-called job skill and turns them out illiterate and without acceptable work habits, and therefore unemployable.

Investment

The employability issue leads naturally to the second issue of investment. We looked at as many programs as we could to determine whether they could be measured the same way we measure investments in business, and one program emerges clearly. That is preschool education at the age of three for children from severely disadvantaged families. I define a disadvantaged family as one in which any adult in the household is illiterate and doesn't mind. Now you can't use that definition to install a program for disadvantaged children. You always end up falling back on an economic rationale, but that comes pretty close to targeting the group in greatest need. A child who grows up in such a household, where all of the adults are illiterate and don't care that they are illiterate, is a doomed child.

The evidence on that is clear. That is where the majority of our five hundred thousand per year school failures come from, and they cannot be saved by the school system, except in very rare instances. They have failed when they reach first grade. They reach first grade so far behind their peers that they give up, and nobody likes to play losing games. Nobody in this room likes to play a losing game. Somebody asked me twenty years ago why I quit playing golf. I said, because I'm not very good at it and don't enjoy doing things I am not good at. Who does? All of us spend our time doing things at which we acquire skill, where we can compete successfully. Children who enter the first grade and find out in the first two weeks that their development is so inferior that they cannot compete with their peers academically, find other areas in which to compete. They compete on the playground shooting baskets, or running races, or seeing who they can beat up, but they will not compete in academics because they cannot.

The data is absolutely clear, that putting a year of effort into those children at the age of three can save half of them. We have over twenty years of testing. We have tracked children all the way from the age of three into their mid-twenties, and can demonstrate that an investment in those children at an early age has paid off — four dollars for one, plus interest. That's better than drilling oil wells. But it is a front end investment. You make the investment now and you get it back over the years ahead. But if we don't do it, this country faces a tragic future, in my opinion.

There are other good investments. The Job Corps kind of program — residential training in literacy, work habits, and work skills, at a cost of about $20,000 per individual — is still a payout among that group of 3,300,000 16-24 year-olds, who otherwise are going to spend much of their lives in prison. It pays out. It doesn't pay out four for one plus interest, but it gives you your money back plus a reasonable return.

Teacher Work Force

I'm going to skip fairly quickly over the teacher work force, because the Committee for Economic Development study made a series of specific recommendations, among which was that somebody ought to take that subject and probe it a good deal more deeply. The Carnegie Institute convened a group to do that, and the next speaker served on that group. I will say just a couple of things.

This is one area that costs money. You have to pay teachers more money. How do you know that? Because as a nation, we are not attracting enough people into teaching to fill the classrooms. Even at that, we are filling the classrooms with young people whose SAT scores are 10 percent below the average on verbal, and 15 percent below the average on math. We are attracting our poorest high school students to be the teachers of our next generation. Even with those standards we cannot fill our classrooms.

There are a lot of things we have to do to improve the teaching profession. One is to pay more money. I would suggest that there is nothing more important that legislators and businessmen can do than to get something happening in West Virginia. Not hold conferences. We've had enough conferences on education in the United States in the last five years to have solved the problem, but conferences do not solve the problem, action does. Education takes place in the classroom. It takes place in the school building. One of the clear facts of life is that education is not a problem of demographics. A recent urban study shows clearly that, of two schools in similar poverty-stricken, racially diverse neighborhoods, one produces excellent results, while another fails miserably. The difference is the principal.

Principals may be the key element in schools. This is something business people can do something about. There is hardly a school system in America where principals are put into that job because they have any management skills or management training. They were made principals because they were teachers, but the jobs are vastly different. They become principals, frequently not because that's what they want to do, but because that's the only way they can make more money.

Business people can make an immense contribution to education by adopting principals, and teaching principals how to manage and evaluate people. This idea of giving tests to teachers to measure their competency is a confession of total inadequacy on the part of school management. As a sales manager at Proctor and Gamble, if somebody suggested to me that I give my existing salespeople a competency test, I would have thought they were crazy. I would have regarded it as a dreadful insult. Testing, as a means of helping to evaluate a candidate for a job, is one thing. But once individuals are on a job for any length of time, a manager who cannot evaluate those persons, or describe their strengths and weaknesses, or decide their competency for the job, is no manager. Unfortunately, many of our principals are not managers. However, the solution is not to test teachers. The solution is to train the principals to manage: to manage people, to motivate them, to evaluate them, and to help train them.

You can do that. Take the 67 recommendations in the CED report. It cost us a million dollars "out-of-pocket" to produce it, and three years of heavy time investment from twenty corporate presidents and chairmen. There is two million dollars worth of study and conclusions in that book —two million dollars and three years—and you can buy it for nine dollars and fifty cents and read it in an hour.

You can implement it if you want to. About 40 of the 67 recommendations can be implemented without a nickel of increased spending. In fact, many of the recommendations will save money.

Deregulation

One of the most important suggestions is to deregulate the school. Schools are the most regulated industry in America. And regulation everywhere is generally counterproductive. Regulators, whether they be in the EPA or the airline industry or in the school superintendent's office, invariably tell people what to do instead of what to achieve. The reason America and Japan have led the world versus the Communist socialist countries is that we have rewarded people for what they achieve, rather than what they do. It's just a better way to get results.

Look at your regulations. You will find, in your state or any other state, that regulations have very little to say about what a student must learn. They say how many hours the student must spend in classrooms on this subject and that subject and another subject. Who cares? Do you really care? If you've got a principal who can run a school without ever giving a class in English composition, but the students graduate as superb writers, do you really care? The best way to teach English composition may be to insist that when a student writes a history paper, or a geography paper, or a paper on any required subject, that paper be graded for literacy of composition, as well as for subject matter. But no principal can do that in most school systems, because there is a book of rules that says students must spend so many hours on English composition.

When I went to college briefly during the War, I had a professor of spherical trigonometry who had never been given tenure at the college because the other mathematics professors thought he cheated. He ran a tutoring course as a young associate, and all the people who took his tutoring course got A's on exams. They just concluded that he must be cheating and giving them the answers. He was not. He was simply a superb teacher. On the first day in class he said, "If you were smart, I could teach you the full content of this course in 16 hours. If you were stupid I could teach it to you in 32 hours. The Navy has assigned you 48 hours. That shows what they think of you, but I don't know how to spend 48 hours on this subject. I will assume that you are stupid and spend 32 hours, so Monday and Wednesday we will do spherical trig and Friday we'll tell stories. Anybody who doesn't want to come on Fridays doesn't have to come. If you come, come with a good story to tell." All of his students scored A or B on a spherical trigonometry exam.

Now isn't it a crime to tell that teacher how many hours he has to teach spherical trigonometry instead of telling him what to teach? Think what he could have taught us if he had an open opportunity to teach any mathematics he wanted to so long as we were equipped to pass the spherical trig exam. The greatest single thing the legislators can do for education in West Virginia is define what students must acquire from their schooling, establish a measurement to determine that they are acquiring that, and then turn the principals and teachers loose to teach the most effectively and most productively. That will do more to stimulate your teachers. It will do more to improve their morale. It will do more to tell your students what they are in school for. It will raise the level of education quicker than any other single thing you can do. And it does not cost a penny. In fact, it probably saves money.

Priorities

I'm going to give you one other piece of information. We are spending 12 billion dollars more money on public schools in this country today than we were ten years ago for the administrative end of education. We spend about 120 billion dollars now. Ten percent more of the money now goes for non-teaching, than just ten years ago. That is 12 billion dollars. Do you know what could be done with 12 billion dollars? You could give that year of nurturing to every disadvantaged three-year-old in the country at a cost of five thousand dollars per child. And you could raise every teacher's salary twelve percent, without another nickel of tax money.

My father was a shoe cutter. He worked in a shoe factory in Lynchburg originally and then in a little town in Pennsylvania and then in Baltimore. Every thing I have been able to achieve in my lifetime is a function of the fact that his generation had the right set of priorities for public education. I would point out that I went to school from 1929 to 1940. Those were not rosy days. My parents and their generation were not sacrificing third cars or second cars or sail boats or vacations to pay for schools. They were putting rice and beans on the table instead of steak.

Yet, I never heard a word of complaint from my parents or even from neighbors who had no children. They assumed that was the right set of priorities, that providing the resources to develop the next generation was first. And if we don't come back to that point of view, that we need to provide that opportunity to every child born in this country, including the 500,000 who are born into illiterate families, then we are not going to have a prosperous economy, and we are not going to have the kind of country in which you and I have had the privilege of living and which we would like for our grandchildren.

I have four grandchildren. Three are in private school. Yet I believe that for those three children who are growing up in private schools, the quality of public education for their peers is the single most important force which will shape the quality of their lives. Because if we do our public education job right, it will influence whether their world is a peaceful, prosperous, harmonious democracy, or whether, in the next twenty years, we become a two class, crime-ridden, frightened non-democracy. That is really the size of the issue we face. And I submit that we have done enough talking about it. It's time to fix it.

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century

Lewis M. Branscomb
Vice President and Chief Scientist
International Business Machines Corporation;
Chairman, Carnegie Corporation Task Force
on Teaching as a Profession

Introduction

I am delighted to be here, and I appreciate this opportunity to talk to you about the Carnegie Corporation project on education.

Two or three years ago, there was an important meeting in New York, organized by Governor Hunt of North Carolina and Dave Hamburg, the new president of Carnegie Corporation. The meeting brought together a great many leaders from many sectors of our society to explore the question of what the Carnegie Corporation might do over a decade in the area of education, as it relates to the future of the economy.

Subsequently, they made the decision to create an organization within the Carnegie Corporation staff, called the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, of which I and several others are members of the Advisory Council. The first project of that Carnegie Forum was a Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Our Task Force report, "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century," has attracted a groundswell of interest that is still growing.

Support

I think it is particularly important that the two teachers' unions, the AFT and the NEA, both of whose presidents participated in our work, had this as a major item of discussion at their national conventions in July. And it is being taken quite seriously by those two organizations, both of which, in fact, endorse some important segments of our recommendations. The report is aimed at empowering teachers to give us the kind of schools that we think will be necessary for the United States to retain its current standard of living. Teacher support for these objectives is absolutely essential if they are to be achieved.

Equally significant is the growing interest of governors in the key states. And I must complement Governor Smith and Governor Moore for their leadership in this meeting. Governor Kean of New Jersey and former Governor Hunt of North Carolina were active and influential members of our Task Force. Governor Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, who is chairman of this year's National Governors' Association (NGA), will make the Carnegie plan a key element of the NGA meeting later this month, in an

29

agenda already devoted primarily to the NGA's Task Force on Educational Reform.

Last weekend, the Education Commission of the States, which was chaired up until that meeting by Governor Kean, afforded the state chiefs of education and many other state leaders the opportunity to discuss our plan, as well as other issues, in more detail. Governor Clinton of Arkansas played a very important role in that meeting, and has been a leader in his state as well.

In addition, editorial opinion and newspaper, radio, and television coverage have been extensive and overwhelmingly favorable. And yet, education reports are a "dime a dozen." Indeed, it seems to be a feature of democracies that citizen reports which view with alarm seem to be the white blood cells of the body politic. When its institutions are diseased or injured, such reports usually multiply rapidly and surround the affected organ until the fever for remedial action has cooled.

Now why should this report be any different?

Consensus

Well, first, because it was not written by political or academic bystanders (with a few exceptions). It was written by a team of people, most of whom are major stakeholders in education. The test of our advice was, would we ourselves take action on it?

Thus, the achievement of our consensus, to the extent we did achieve one, was almost more important than the details of the plan we adopted. We knew agreement wouldn't be easy. But we felt that if agreement could be reached within our group, we might be optimistic that consensus might be achieved among the parties at interest in the nation.

Commitment

Second, at the Carnegie Forum '86 meeting in San Diego last May, the Carnegie Corporation announced that it would follow up this project for a decade, investing in the implementation of the recommendations through the support of research, state leaders, and other things that will be uncovered as time goes along.

This summer, our Task Force, which completed its first assignment on schedule within one year, is being expanded—by the addition of teachers, teacher educators, and other appropriate specialists—to become a planning body for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Research on fair and effective testing methods has been funded. Neither we on the Task Force, nor the Carnegie Corporation, intend to walk away from our commitment to see these recommendations converted to action.

Radical Change

And third, we quite consciously recommended radical, and not incremental change. We did this not only because we think restoring schools to the

1950's standards is not good enough, but because we believe radical change — a new design point for our schools — may, in fact, be easier to achieve than incremental change. With radical change, the benefits have some possibility of being great enough to motivate all the parties at interest to share in the risk. With incremental change, each group tends to wait for concessions from others before taking a risk for only marginal advantage. In any event, we haven't time for small steps taken sequentially. The target for what kind of education our children need in a competitive world is changing, even as we try to restore our schools to their former quality.

It is a central thesis of this report that a reform movement that restores our schools to the 1950's is not good enough. We must design them for the economic and social conditions Americans will face in the 21st century. Just as Americans face the task of restructuring our economy to focus on the areas where we can be the most successful, so too we must restructure our educational system to prepare our young people for the opportunities that continue to exist for interesting, productive lives.

Competition

Governor Richard Lamm of Colorado, in a meeting last month, put the challenge very well:

> "The U.S. is rapidly losing its industrial competitiveness and its social competitiveness. We have not met the challenge required by history to keep our institutions effective and efficient. We have the illusions of prosperity, but in many desperately important areas, we are losing our ability to compete. Our institutions have lost much of their problem-solving capacity. They have grown too incestuous, bureaucratic, unresponsive, risk-averse, non-creative and complacent . . ."

That's all too good a description of many of our schools today.

Our starting point is that challenge: the need for a work force prepared for participation in an information-intensive economy, competing with people from many other countries that have adopted the same strategy. Most Americans have an incorrect view of the competition we face for jobs from countries in Asia and elsewhere that have lower wages than we do. Let's take South Korea, for example. It is true that South Koreans get paid about $3,000 a year. But, South Koreans have, first of all, a work ethic that makes the Puritan work ethic look like sitting on the beach. And more importantly, they believe in education.

IBM Corporation has subsidiaries in some 120 countries around the world, and we take pride in having them managed and staffed by nationals of the country, with very, very few foreigners in any of those companies. When we look at the country president or general manager right down to the lowest level employee, the prize winner in the world is South Korea. It is not the United States; it is not France, Germany, or England. So, Americans must compete with other countries that believe even more in education than many of our own people seem to.

Let me give an example, based on my own business experience. My company competes in the information industry—the most rapidly changing, most competitive industry in the world. Modern science is driving a technology that permits huge increases in performance and reductions in cost of the industry's products every year. Any firm that falls behind, falls behind very fast.

Automation in our factories has not reduced the number of people so much as it has upgraded their skills. Labor costs are still a very substantial portion of product cost, but the people tend to be employees who, by participating in our education programs and on-the-job training, have upgraded their skills and been able to migrate into new areas of production technology. Former machine operators are programmers for a computer-integrated manufacturing system. Workers who did manual piece-parts assembly are now maintenance engineers on automated tools.

We have succeeded in maintaining our decades-old tradition of full employment — avoiding layoffs during slack business periods, in part by retraining thousands of workers into technical and professional jobs. This has enriched their work experience and made the company more competitive — generating earnings per employee that have permitted compensation appropriate to the higher skill levels our people have attained. So, our products are still labor-intensive, and yet for most of our products, the factory direct labor is only three or four percent of product cost.

How were we able to do this? First, because we are able to hire people who are well-educated and flexible enough to be able to continue their education on the job. And we have known very well that our company is able to get the cream of the crop. Second, because we invest 900 million dollars annually in continuing education and retraining, and that is on top of the salaries we pay our employees while they are in our schools—which more than doubles the 900 million dollars.

There will be no slowdown in the intellectual demands placed on employees like ours. In the future, they will have to handle more complex tasks, make more independent decisions, and handle a broader range of problems than they do today.

This is not just in manufacturing industries but throughout the economy, in every job where working smarter is important to success. Thus, every company in America has a great stake in the base of public education. The people themselves, of course, have the greatest stake.

Teacher Shortages

Unfortunately, even the modest progress in school reform made to date is threatened by changing demographic patterns.

The children of the postwar "baby boom" are now swelling the number of children entering school. Yet teaching ranks are depleted—especially of younger teachers — because of the losses from teaching as enrollment declined during the years when fewer children were entering school. In other words, the young teachers today are from the "baby bust" generation, if you like. Thus, we face a growing shortage of teachers.

The shortage is exacerbated by the attractiveness of other career opportunities for college-educated people. For young women, this very welcome opening-up of career options has produced dramatic changes in their own expectations. So too for minorities.

In 1969, 36 percent of college freshmen women expected to go into teaching. Fifteen years later, this number was down to eight percent, while 21 percent expected a career in business (by the way, a larger percentage than for males in their own class).

In the case of science and mathematics students, alternatives to teaching have reduced the supply of new science and mathematics teachers to a critical level already. For example, the National Center of Educational Statistics has reported that, in 1979-80, only 42 percent of newly-hired mathematics teachers, and 45 percent of new biology and physical science teachers, were certified to teach in these fields. And in 1981, the National Science Teachers Association found that half of the teachers hired nationwide to teach secondary mathematics and science were unqualified.

For minority teachers, the situation is even more serious, since losses from the educational pipeline occur continuously from elementary school all the way to graduate school. The percentage of new teachers from minority groups is falling just as the number of minority children entering school is growing rapidly.

Let me put this demographic challenge in its starkest form using a figure given by former Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall, who presented this information at our San Diego conference. He is an expert on labor demography, and he says that in the year 2020, the U.S. work force will be larger than it is today by 38 million people. Mind you, that is only 36 years from now; the 36-year old workers of 2020 have already been born. So that is not a matter of a lot of projection. Interestingly, that work force, larger by 38 million, will have exactly the same number of white males in it as it has today. That means that this country not only has to compete, with its present work force, with countries around the world; we have to educate, acculturate, and bring up to the American standard of work performance what amounts to a developing country of 38 million people.

Strategies of Response

There are two possible strategies for dealing with this supply-demand imbalance. If we continue as we are today, school districts will lower standards, states will issue temporary licenses, and a growing number of teachers will teach out of subject. The best teachers now in school will be increasingly dispirited and will leave in increasing numbers, and the more academically accomplished students entering college will vote with their feet to avoid teaching. The quality of education offered our children will accelerate its decline, as the ranks of teachers are filled by drawing on an even larger fraction of the least qualified pool of applicants.

Our alternative strategy is admittedly bold, but it can work. We begin by:

- Raising the standards for teachers;
- Strengthening their educational preparation;
- Revamping their compensation system;
- Restructuring the schools to make teaching more effective, productive, and rewarding; and
- Encouraging communities to set goals for school performance, to which teachers can commit themselves, and for which they are willing to be accountable.

In short, we want to empower the educators to educate, encourage innovative ways to leverage the skill of the best teachers, to make teaching a profession, and to make the school a collegial place for professionals to work toward common objectives.

We recognize that raising standards as a response to an impending shortage may seem counter-productive. But we are persuaded that the only way to attract a sufficient number of qualified people into teaching is to alter the professional environment in the schools to make a teaching career attractive, and to open entry into the profession to all college arts and sciences graduates. In any case, we will only be deceiving ourselves if communities succeed in populating their classrooms with adults who go through the motions but are not effective teachers.

I will summarize our Carnegie plan proposals, largely for the purpose of showing how necessary each is to the effectiveness of the next. For we are convinced that all of them must be addressed as a package.

We could begin at several points in this program of change. Let me start with standards.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

We propose a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards be created and run by the profession, in order to establish and maintain its own standards. It would develop new methods of assessment, both for subject matter competence and, most importantly, the demonstrated ability to teach.

The Board would issue certificates attesting to two levels of competence. A majority of the Board would be elected by other teachers who have already been Board-certified. Teachers would seek Board certification voluntarily; licensure continues to be a responsibility of the states. But we believe that school boards will be eager to recognize the value of Board-certified teachers in their recruiting, and teachers will be eager to achieve this objective recognition of their own professional standing.

Restructuring Schools

Restructuring of the schools is needed to make the best use of those well qualified, certified teachers.

We envision two levels of responsibility within the professional school faculty: teachers and lead teachers. Supporting them are a variety of other staff, including instructors with subject matter competence but requiring supervision, a variety of technical and volunteer staff and, finally and importantly, student tutors. Given the shortage of both experienced, qualified teachers, and of community resources, it makes little sense to staff all the tasks in a school with people of identical responsibility. Yet, this is the pattern of our schools today. The unions refer to it as a "lateral profession." That means everybody in the organization has the same job description.

Restructuring should extend the educational influence, and hence the value of teaching professionals. If, in addition, teachers are encouraged to work together in a collegial manner, making creative use of all the resources in the school in the best interests of all the students, it is very likely that would begin to break away from the traditional classroom compartmentalization of the school and the isolation of teachers from one another. Many teachers today go to school in the morning and leave in the afternoon, never having seen another adult all day. If professional teachers, who meet high standards, are allowed to work like professionals, they are much more likely to deliver the quality of education of which they, and their supporting staff, are capable.

Teacher Training

Of course, if we expect a lot more from the professional teacher, we must provide a stronger educational system to train our teachers. We recommend phasing out the undergraduate baccalaureate degree in education (as many states have already done), requiring instead that all teachers — including those who teach elementary school — have an arts and science baccalaureate.

A Master in Teaching degree would be introduced, with strong focus on learning how to teach in real life situations. Internship and supervised residency conducted in participating local public schools are the core of this concept. Under this arrangement, any college graduate in the arts and sciences—including mature people in other industries interested in taking up teaching—could take the Master in Teaching program or enter teaching by an approved alternative path. The potential pool of well-educated people for future teachers would then be greatly expanded.

Compensation

Even so, higher standards, a professional environment for teaching, and stronger education for teachers will not attract to teaching careers the more than 200,000 college graduates per year needed by 1992, unless the compensation system for teachers is restructured too.

We favor abolishing the current system of paying teachers more for taking continuing education courses. In fact, that is an often corrupted system. I've had letters from a science teacher in California who is certified in five areas of science, has 120 credits of graduate courses, was valedictorian of her class, and graduated cum laude in her university. And she is unable to get a job because the school personnel office says that she costs $8,000 a year more than an inexperienced teacher. I've had other teachers tell me that smart teachers conceal the graduate courses they have taken until after they get tenure, and then they announce their graduate work and get the money it brings.

That is a fraudulent system, and it reflects school districts that are hiring baby-sitters instead of teachers.

We would base our compensation on four elements:

- The level of Board certification obtained;
- The level of responsibility in the school;
- Experience (if you like, seniority); and
- The performance of the students in the entire school against agreed objectives.

The pay scale that reflects these elements must have an adequate starting salary and will have to rise, on the average. Salary range, from top to bottom, would also be increased substantially to reflect the same elements. The biggest change in compensation required is to introduce differentiation in range.

To attract able college graduates to teaching, they will have to be paid competitively with other careers requiring comparable education — accountants, for example. Teachers also need opportunities for career advancement when their professional attainment and job responsibilities justify it. Today's teachers "top out" in salary after ten or twelve years, except for annual cost of living raises. It is no wonder that half of the people in teaching leave by their seventh year. Clearly, if higher performance is expected of teachers, then there must be incentives that justify their commitment; and they, in turn, must accept accountability for the achievement of agreed community goals.

That is what we mean by the performance-based element of compensation. We visualize a school district discussing with the community, and with education leaders in the community's schools, the potential for progress of all the students in each school. Each year's goals are agreed to by the teachers, who are rewarded collectively if the goal is overachieved. (If that sounds a little familiar to you business people who are accustomed to setting performance plans, it has the same kind of motivating character to it.) Teachers should have incentives to work together creatively to address the needs of all the children in the school.

Our schools have very little experience with such incentive systems; a great deal of discussion with teachers and school officials will no doubt be required to find satisfactory methods. But citizens in the community must be able to measure whether or not their investments in reform are producing the desired results.

Racial and Socioeconomic Balance

Finally, it must be said that the most serious challenge may be to preserve a reasonable degree of racial and socioeconomic balance in the teacher population while higher standards are imposed. No one, especially no minority parent, would want differential standards, with minority teachers held to lower standards. Minority children, indeed all children, need the very best teachers, representing all races and ethnic backgrounds in America. Higher standards are most important to ensure that those children from poor families are given every chance to break out of the cycle of poverty. But to ensure their motivation and their self-confidence, these children must encounter teachers from their own background from time to time.

Improving the compensation system for all teachers and making their work more attractive will, of course, equally attract minority as well as white teachers. But so many minority students are lost from leaks in the educational pipeline that the pool of minority college graduates is too small to provide teachers in the numbers anywhere near approaching the mix of students.

In this area, partnerships of community-based organizations, businesses, institutions, and schools, funded from state and federal sources and local business, have to address the education of disadvantaged students starting at the precollege level, in order to produce more minority teachers.

Costs and Benefits

The program I have described will be expensive. So too will continuing on present course and speed. As the old saw says, "If you think a good education is expensive, just try ignorance." But why does the Task Force think this revolution will happen, given the historic resistance to change of the American school system?

Obstacles to success are indeed formidable. All public sector institutions are under serious financial pressure. A very rapidly increasing fraction of voters who must approve school finances are older people, many retired. Parents of children in school are a declining percentage of the electorate. In addition, voter attention span for most political issues is transitory. Education requires a decade of active political commitment; indeed, it really requires permanent active political commitment.

Perhaps the most serious obstacle is cynicism and apathy, especially on the part of many teachers, and many students too. (I'm sure you heard about the student who was asked, "Why are so many young people today ignorant and apathetic?" He answered, "I don't know, and I don't care.") Nevertheless, the time for this revolution has come. The driving forces will be the growing teacher shortage and the growing awareness — especially among governors, legislators, business leaders, and others — of the link between the promise of better education and the attraction of new jobs and preserving old ones.

To those who say it will be too expensive, our report notes that without counting any savings through higher educational effectiveness, less remedial teaching in the colleges, less wasted teacher education on those who leave the profession after seven years, the costs are manageable. Education need get only the same fraction of GNP that it has historically enjoyed, over a period of the next ten to fifteen years.

In fact, the costs will not be spread evenly over the nation. Some communities will make big investments because they believe in the results they will get. They will do so because teachers convince them that better learning will result if the schools are staffed and run differently. Others will wait and see. But if a dozen or so states make a success of the second wave of reform, others will be driven to compete, even if the federal government does not take an active part in the quest for regional equity of opportunity —which I personally believe the federal government should do.

The Carnegie Forum's message to the governors at the National Governors' Association meeting three weeks from now is going to be: if the governors will take the lead in their states with the help of legislators, business leaders, teachers' organizations, parents and citizens, the Carnegie Corporation will try to provide the technical support needed in order to try to implement the program.

I can't think of anything that could be more important to our country, or a more exciting adventure to be embarked upon.

What a State Can Do To Improve Education

Winfred Godwin
President
Southern Regional Education Board

Introduction

My assignment today is to talk about the process for state actions with respect to improving education. For some time the need to make dramatic improvements in education has been clear to leaders in many of our state governments. In fact, that was the case long before the publication in 1983 of *A Nation at Risk*, which made educational improvement a watchword for the nation at large. States and, especially, Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states began significant efforts to improve quality in the late 1970's and early 1980's. In fact, in 1981 SREB set out 25 specific recommendations for raising quality in schools and colleges, stressing the link between the schools and higher education. So that by 1983, many states could point to numerous, specific actions that they had taken to improve education.

Emerging Consensus

While these early actions were commendable, in nearly every state, a consensus has been developing about the need to improve education. There are many important differences among the states, but basically the reasoning in this emerging consensus goes something like this.

The first element recognizes that the future of our state is tied to the quality of our education system. In many cases, the tie may be quite direct. In others it may be indirect, but, nevertheless, in the economy that will characterize this nation, our states' future needs depend more than ever on education. Various states around the country are providing further evidence of what West Virginia has long known, that abundant natural resources certainly do not ensure a successful economy.

The second element of reasoning behind the emerging consensus is a recognition that, while almost every state has taken notable steps to improve education, we have not made an all-out, concerted effort, or a commitment to fundamentally change and improve the system.

The third element of the consensus agrees that the fundamental changes needed will require extraordinary and concerted actions by many parties. Leadership for this will have to come from government, from business, and from citizen leaders working with educators. Without this extraordinary effort and commitment, long-term improvement is not likely to occur.

These points may oversimplify the consensus that states are reaching, but, basically, they are correct. A consensus to take coordinated new actions in building from a variety of directions, from business, from industry, from education, from the lay citizenry at large, is emerging. This effort is not a negative one, although at many times it sounds that way because it is frank about weaknesses and shortcomings in the educational system. This consensus is almost universally bipartisan, and it is important that it remain so. Tennessee is a good example. Republican Governor Lamar Alexander worked with an overwhelmingly Democratic Legislature in a special session to pass an historic education reform act in 1984.

Study Groups and Business Leadership

Once a consensus has emerged that an extraordinary effort and commitment to improve education is needed, the next step is usually a high profile study. Some high level study group is commissioned to present a series of comprehensive recommendations. Typically, the governor of a state appoints a "blue ribbon committee" made up of outstanding leaders from government, business, education, and the general citizenry. In almost every state, an outstanding business leader has chaired this group and become the key citizen spokesman for educational change and improvement.

Examples of business leadership are important and reflect a common theme. Let me mention Texas first. Ross Perot, whom I guess we could say is the John Wayne of the business world, almost singlehandedly shaped the Texas Reform Act. Then, after the Governor had endorsed it, Perot dared legislators and educators to oppose it. That's a bit of an overstatement but not by very much. There may be only one Ross Perot, admittedly, but the leadership of business in other states has been nearly as effective, if not as flamboyant. Take Georgia for instance. An Atlanta businessman active in civic affairs in the metropolitan area, but with no previous involvement in education, chaired an 18-month Governor's Study Commission. He headed an often unwieldy 40-person commission, and by leadership, insistence, and hard work, was able to hammer out what became Georgia's Quality Basic Education Act. It passed unanimously in both Houses of the State Legislature.

Again, in South Carolina the business leadership role was perhaps even more critical than in Georgia, because in Georgia, thanks to a booming economy, revenue was no problem. It was available if the State Legislature could agree that education was the priority for which it should be spent. But in South Carolina, there was no money. Educational improvement clearly meant a tax increase. Governor Riley, popular as he was, could not have sold that to the people of South Carolina and to the General Assembly of South Carolina without the active participation of the Business Task Force. This group of business leaders supported the drive for new revenue in exchange for very direct accountability which made a lot of educators squirm. But it was a package deal. It was adopted, and the

Business Task Force has remained in place as a watchdog group, to see that the Legislators and the educators are doing what they promised to do.

In the neighboring state of Kentucky, the state Chamber of Commerce was an early driving force for reform in education. This group produced a series of "white papers" that brought public attention to Kentucky's very serious educational problems. The Chamber of Commerce was one of Governor Martha Layne Collins's key allies. When she called a special session of the Legislature, to pass a series of important educational reforms and new revenue measures, they were behind her.

Commitment by Government Leaders

In those states where the process has reached the Legislature, governmental leaders have made an almost extraordinary commitment. That commitment has generally been twofold: in terms of dollars, and in terms of a determination to see improvements through in the long term. The commitment of dollars has generally been quite substantial. New state revenues or new taxes have been put through committee in many instances. The extent of determination is, of course, more difficult to gauge, but it is evidenced in tangible actions by government, business, and citizen leaders. One of these actions is the establishment of special oversight committees to routinely review the implementation of legislated educational reforms, to make recommendations about further improvements, and to keep the spotlight on the need for change and improvement in education. I mentioned the South Carolina group which does this; Tennessee has a legislator oversight group. The particular details of the process are not as important as the demonstration of determination to hold everyone's feet to the fire to meet their commitments.

Reform from "Outside"

Early reforms have come from outside education, from governors, from legislators, and from business leaders. That is a fact. I believe that it has also been a necessity. For instance, more than half the states in the nation would not be working on ways to pay outstanding teachers more if Governor Alexander had not used a battering ram against the idea that seniority and degrees alone do not provide a basis on which states should pay teachers. He was criticized for not involving teachers more in the initial process, but he made it possible for other states to involve teachers and to develop incentive pay programs.

The Tennessee program—a state centralized one—is not being duplicated wholesale around the country. Instead, we are seeing more teacher and local school board involvement in new career ladders, staff development, and incentive pay plans. But Tennessee's action changed the dynamics of the whole situation and made possible subsequent developments elsewhere.

We're hearing from various groups that the second wave of reform must include more local involvement, and I agree. But I doubt seriously that we would be where we are had we not had the state initiatives. States that adopt major reforms in the future may well be able to combine state and local actions better because of ground broken elsewhere.

Finally, there is obviously no single set of recommendations for improving quality of education in a state. States are at different points. They have different histories. They have different cultures. They have different strengths, different needs, and different shortcomings in their educational systems. But the overall process, by which leaders come to an agreement that a special effort is needed and then follow through on that commitment, is more similar than different among the states. The key is getting people involved, who have not been involved previously. That's a very powerful force for changing and improving education and one that should certainly not be underestimated or under-utilized.

Conclusion

Finally, I want to commend the Council on Economic Development on its many years of work on behalf of better education to improve the economic strength of America. I also want to say to Dr. Branscomb that the Carnegie Forum has rendered a great service. You have posed radical recommendations that should stimulate state and local consideration of important issues — the role of teachers versus management, the nature of teacher preparation, and so on. We do have many useful, helpful reports and recommendations, but the key, in every state that has made a substantial change in its educational system, has been the involvement of new people committed to a long-term reform. It is a commitment that, perhaps at first glance, may seem to be working from the top down, but, in the long run, promises change and involvement throughout the system.

Symposium I: Discussion

Smith: We have now reached the point in our program today for the panelists to answer questions and to have some discussion regarding many of the interesting topics that they have brought up. I heard someone say a few moments ago, "That's wonderful. How do we do it?" And so you might want to ask these people, "Now that you've got these wonderful ideas—how should we do it?"

Comment: I am a member of the state board, and we have a perennial problem, in my mind, of, on the one hand, requiring accountability, monitoring, and regulating; and on the other hand, empowering the local schools and teachers to do their jobs. As it says in the report, we should not tell the teachers what to do, but empower them to do what is necessary.

Branscomb: Certainly.

I think the starting point is, that if the community does not have a good process for defining what it wants from its schools, then it is almost inevitable that some authority—probably at the state level—is going to try to do that for the benefit of all the children and the parents in the state. And the result has the effect of being, in many cases, design rather than performance standards.

And I must say I was deeply impressed by reading a book titled, *Shopping Mall High School.* If any of you want to get discouraged, read that terrific book, because the book starts out with the premise that all teachers are super and highly motivated—and it says communities get exactly what they want from their schools because, in fact, the community doesn't know what kind of education their children ought to have and really doesn't know what kind they are getting.

The students are having a reasonable social experience, and so long as they go to school and have a decent experience, there is an unwritten contract between student and teacher that says, "You don't hassle me, I won't hassle you." And everybody graduates, and then another group goes through the same process.

So my notion is that the key event is for the community to develop a satisfactory process for specifying educational goals. And that has to get down to the practical nuts and bolts of how to measure it. How can you settle the debate — did the schools do a better job this year than last year? And there are a lot of serious researchers who have worked on that problem. There are the batteries of different kinds of test scores that all schools have today. There are much more practical parameters of school performance — like something as simple as attendance or discipline levels (however that is measured in the school) or attitudes.

If the school community can find some way of rallying around defined goals that can be measured, then we might have something. Maybe before the Board of Education goes to the Legislature with a radical plan for deregulating all the schools in the state, you might invite communities to get involved. A community or district might come forward with its own plan, that says:

"Look, here is how we got our community together. Here's how we would like to measure the performance of our schools. We want the authority to test this group of schools against that set of objectives, and we want them to be given the freedom to figure out *how* to do it. We're going to decide as a community what they are to achieve, and we want you to give us that freedom."

And by the way, I think they might also ask, "Could you give us a little bit of state technical expertise to help us measure and be sure . . . you know, come witness this experiment? We are asking for five years of latitude under some special exceptions."

Now, I don't know whether you have to do that piecemeal or not, but it is possible that, at least in this year, it might be something that would be a very interesting challenge to the local business, educational, and political leadership in the community.

Question: **Mr. Butler, having been a vocational teacher for some 32 years I am a little perturbed over the**

remark you made in regard to vocational education as a fraud. Could you elaborate a little more on that?

Butler: I would be glad to. First, I did not say vocational education was a fraud. I said turning a student out of a program which is called vocational education, if it has not given the student literacy and good work habits is a fraud, and it is. Because a vocational program that fails to teach good work habits and literacy, along with job skills, is not a true vocational program. And I find very few vocational educators who disagree with that.

We spend a good deal of time on vocational education. I guess our real recommendation is that we ought to find a new term. "Vocational education" is a term that has been used to mean so many different things in so many different schools in this country, that nobody knows what it means anymore. There are magnificent vocational schools (they are usually area schools) which have superb academic programs as well as job-relevant skill training, and they are providing a great service to their students.

At the other end of the extreme, there are — particularly in urban school systems — a great many so-called vocational schools which are little more than dumping grounds for students that the system does not know what else to do with. And the general schools take students who cannot read, do not attend school, have terrible work habits, and — in order to protect their per capita income from the state and protect their dropout rate — they slough these children into something they call an educational program, and it is nothing of the sort. It is a device to induce students to come to school by not making them do the things that school is designed to prepare them for. And we have got those things lumped under the term "vocational education."

We ought to recognize, first, that all education is vocational education. There is hardly a student in any public school in America today who does not expect to work and earn a living, and who does not look to his schooling as an important part of the preparation. So all education is, among other things, education for em-

45

ployability. And we have developed an attitude that vocational schools are where you get education for employability, and other schools are for something else. And that's bad.

Vocational schools, properly defined, add relevant job skills to the other essentials of education. And I have great sympathy for the vocational teachers who are required by their school systems to accept students that the rest of the school system does not know what to do with. I feel very strongly that the prerequisite for entry into any vocational school should be a test of literacy and an acceptable standard of attendance and behavior.

But as long as otherwise failing students continue to attend school without acquiring good work habits or literacy, then vocational education is a fraud, even though within vocational education there are some outstanding schools.

I went to a vocational school. At least the Baltimore Manual Training School for Boys is the father of the Baltimore Polytechnical Institute. And it is an example of what can be done with a vocational school, if it has the right standards.

Godwin: Let me add to this vocational education discussion, a specific idea that I got from the principal of a vocational high school in Valdosta, Georgia, and it's an idea that is applicable to any high school in America. It does not cost a nickel, and it does great things. In that principal's school, every student is graded every day on work habits. That is the name of one of the items on the report card. Graded every day, and with a one sentence explanation of the grade for that day. And among the interesting rules he has for his grade is that if students are absent, then they get a zero. If they make up all of the work on their own time, either after school or on the weekend, they get a 70—even if the work is perfect.

He is teaching those students that even if you do everything you are supposed to do, if you don't do it when you're supposed to do it, then that is not top quality performance. It's the kind of thing that any school, any teacher, anywhere, can do tomorrow, at no cost.

Comment: I am a teacher, as well as a legislator. As I listen to your comments today, it seems to me that we have a two-pronged problem. First of all, we have those teachers who are in the classroom now, and second, those teachers that we want to prepare for the future. And I was very impressed with many of your recommendations; in fact, some of them are quite similar to things that have come out of the Southern Regional Education Board.

I agree with us changing the methods, classes, and the education courses for new teachers. I think we need to get people into the classroom actually doing the job, and then back into college. But I'm not sure of the nuts and bolts for those of us who are in the legislature to approach this. It seems to me that we need to make a major overhaul in college — in the teacher preparation program. Your recommendation is to come out with the lead teacher administration in the school system, which I think has some very strong merit.

One of the greatest problems I think we face whenever we try to implement new programs though, is that those people who have been on the job for years and years are not ready to change. They have gotten accustomed to doing a job a certain way. New ideas come and go. In the time that I have been teaching since 1969, we have had three different systems of mathematics come through, and teachers do what they feel works with the students. So they resist change.

So we have a two-pronged problem. One, making the change in colleges, which I think would be the easier of two, but also making the change for the teachers who are already in the classroom, because you are saying, "Let's do it as a radical change now."

Question: **Do you have any examples, nationwide, of teacher preparation programs that even teach the model of a lead teacher system, that we could get copies of and look at? Do you have any models of in-service programs that we can use for the teachers who are in the classroom? Because if you want a program to fail, the way to do it is to not prepare the people that you want to change, before you ask them to change.**

Branscomb: I think your remarks are very perceptive. And I think your remarks contain a lot of the wisdom that causes me to say that all the pieces of this puzzle are interrelated. First of all, many teachers are fixed in their habits, because in fact, that is the way they are employed. They are cast in a rather rigid mold. They are told what the lesson plan is, and they go and sit at their desks or stand at their blackboards in front of a sequence of five groups of 30 students — 150 students a day. How they could possibly write one sentence about the work habits of each of the 150 students every day and not go bananas is unclear to me, and that is part of the problem.

So they are treated like blue collar workers, and they work in an institution that is run like a public utility (apologies to any public utility executives who may be here in the room). Those things, of course, will change slowly. Many parts to your remark, I think are questions.

One is, what about the teachers who are in the system today — who grew up in that system, who may not be trained or appropriate for a much more free-wheeling and complex way of running a school — one in which the teachers have more voice in educational decisions. One obvious answer to that question is that, in time, once you gradually release the constraints and make it clear what you expect from the teachers and give them the freedom to respond, many of them will. And they will be much more innovative than they have the reputation for being in their current, sullen mood, so to speak.

The second point is that many of them indeed are adequate, but barely adequate. They are not such bad teachers that they should be discharged. But on the other hand, you need to be able to find a role for those people that gives them the chance to maximize the skills and talents they have, without making the students vulnerable to their deficiencies.

That seems to call for more flexible patterns of instructional arrangements: classes vary in size; there is more team teaching; the work is divided in different ways; more student tutors are used; and more subprofessionals are used. Therefore, the professional teachers can be given more help by lead teachers and can be assigned roles that they feel some achievement in.

As far as reform in the colleges is concerned, I agree that's probably the easier part of the problem. Because our notion is really to try to draw the future population of teachers from an educational level no lower than that of the average student expectation. And since half the students from high school, in fact, go on to some higher level of education, you would like to think teachers are at least as well educated as the students they are teaching expect to be.

The important issue is that all these pieces have to go together. There is no avoiding taking on the problem slowly and carefully, piece by piece. I doubt if any one of these techniques alone would work very well. Just restructuring the school with lead teachers, professional teachers and sub-professionals would not do very much, unless new teachers were trained to take advantage of those kind of roles, unless the regulatory environment lent itself to taking advantage of them, and unless the compensation encouraged people to make that system work.

I do not think reform consists of structuring the grand plan, enacting it into law, laying it on the schools, and standing back to watch the chaos . . . I think it would be unmitigated chaos.

Comment: But the problem is that you are dealing with people who serve in office for two years, governors who serve for two- or four-year terms. Ideas come. Publicity hits, and time moves on. We have to demonstrate some movement or direction, or we lose any source of momentum, and the opportunity is gone.

As critical as education is, you would not think that it would wither and die, but I grew up in the 1960's when millions were spent on science, to what result? We have the most tenured people in the colleges of education on our campuses. They are usually housed in the oldest buildings; it is the most unexciting of the schools to enter; it has received the least attention over the last ten years, and so that momentum lost its ground.

You talked about employability. But one aspect that you did not include is trainability. Your job skills must be retrained at least three times during your lifetime.

We can teach children to be trainable so that, as their life changes, they remain employable. That flexibility, I think, is really critical to our economy.

Butler: Young people who come into the work force with good work habits and with fluency in the English language are trainable. They can be trained for their first job or their tenth job . . . because those are the foundations.

Branscomb: I would like to endorse that notion. That is why I mentioned the huge sums of money my company spends training its people; it really does matter how trainable they are.

I agree with your comment on what constitutes trainability, but it is not just literacy; it's also training to solve problems and address new issues, and a flexible turn of mind that comes from that kind of education.

If I were a legislator and faced the problem you described—and a school system in which the teachers are rigid of habit, where everybody is convinced that nothing can be done, that even massive sums of money might not help—I think I would be inclined to talk to the school board officials and the superintendent in my district and say, "Would you folks join with me in calling a conference? We want the teachers to participate, but also the citizens, local officials, and business leaders. And the purpose of this conference is to ask, could you folks get together and tell us whether or not — if we gave you more latitude, changed the rules, changed the circumstances, reorganized the situation, gave you more flexibility—could you deliver a better education? If so, what do you need?"

I think they would be so startled that you'd asked the question in the first place that it would generate a lot of excitement in the schools. If there are leaders in those schools among the teachers and principals, you might get a recipe for a significant effort at progress that the community would respond to. And I think that once the teachers started thinking about themselves as educational innovators and thought that was even possible, you might find them rising to the occasion to a greater degree than you think possible.

Question: One of the speakers made a comment that the total sum of money we are talking about, if we went the whole radical change, isn't a bigger investment than we are making now, or not much bigger. **Were you talking over the long term? I can't envision this without, at least, a short-term increase in investment. I would just like for you to expand on money — where do we get it and how do we do it?**

Branscomb: Let me define precisely what we said in the report. We were recommending a compensation system that would cause many states to increase entry-level compensation (although many have already done it), which means a bigger spread, and, therefore, a higher average. So it's going to cost money.

If every school district in America and every state paid salaries that had some reasonable chance of attracting into education a fair share of college graduates, what would it cost? After careful study, we took accountants as the standard of comparison.

We did not base the analysis on the assertion (which may, in fact, be true) that most teachers are in teaching for altruistic reasons—that, if they have a satisfying life as a teacher, they are willing to work for less than they could earn in another profession. I think it's wrong to trade on that altruism; I'd rather get extra dedication to the students for the altruism, and not try to extract it in lower compensation. But without giving any credit for altruism, if you pay teachers what the world pays accountants, it would cost you today . . . instantly, 47 billion dollars more. Now that is a bunch of money.

We are already spending close to 140 billion dollars on K-12 schools. What we said in the report was that if, indeed, you wanted to pay every teacher in America like you pay accountants, but didn't do it overnight (because, after all, you could not decide who to pay that much under our scheme that quickly; it's performance-based), suppose you spend ten years doing it— 10 or 15 years getting there from here. If you spread that out and give education the same percentage of GNP (not the same percentage of the state budget), then it wouldn't cost any bigger percentage of the GNP than you are spending now.

We know that people are against taxes. That being the case, education is getting its share of the state budgets in most states—a rising share in those progressive states trying to do something about education. But the state income is not going with the GNP. So I recognize that this calculation doesn't mean it is easy for a legislature to find money in the state budget to make the additional investments we are talking about . . . but it's necessary.

Good teachers, after teaching six or seven years, should have a notion of future opportunity instead of a dead-ended career. And now you've got to provide compensation that goes with that, but you don't have to pay everybody like we pay accountants overnight.

We're going to have to hire a million teachers in the next seven or eight years. That may be tough. It's going to cost more, but it probably is not going to cost anything like what I described. At a national level, it certainly is not, because not every community and state is going to do it.

We put that in there because we knew we would be asked. It's not a very realistic calculation, because that is not how a state or community would go about it.

Question: Mr. Butler, I appreciate your comments on the top-heaviness in some school systems' administration in our nation. **I was wondering if you could suggest — since these administrators are the advocates and consultants for how a county will spend its money — how the legislature would control or initiate cutbacks, when we're usually relying upon such individuals for advice on how to run the school system?**

Butler: How do you get the bureaucracy to tell you you ought to reduce the bureaucracy? I'm not sure. In this case, I think the legislature has to think of itself as management, make some tough decisions, and enforce them.

The whole issue of regulation versus bureaucracy is behind a number of these questions. Industry has been forced to recognize this problem, because industry in this country has gotten pretty bureaucratic and regulated — self-regulated as well as regulated by outside forces — and very comfortable with it. But we operate in a free marketplace, and international competition forced us to get out of it. The managements which shook themselves up and did get out of it are surviving; the ones who didn't are not and won't. School systems are among the most bureaucratic organizations in this country. You, as legislators, are ultimately responsible for the school system, and may decide what you want to do about it, but doing things is not easy.

You have to start with the recognition that regulation and bureaucracy inevitably reward and protect the least efficient, least effective, and least creative people. Regulation and bureaucracy frustrate and drive out the most creative, most capable people. Do you want to continue such a system?

It is tough; it is soul-wrenching. You say teachers don't want to change? Neither do union members in our plants. The people who have 20 or 30 years in a craft union that says the machine adjuster cannot change the light bulb over his machine doesn't want to change that. Change isn't easy, and it extracts a toll from management.

Change in your educational system will extract a toll from those of you who have to answer to the system and the public. But I think you're going to have to mandate the changes. In order to make them possible, though, you're going to have to change the rules of the schools. You're going to have to change to a results-oriented system. But it will be fought every inch of the way.

I disagree that the toughest place to change is at the teacher level, any more that it is at the worker level. The toughest place to change is in middle management. In the schools, that means the principals and the superintendents.

Generally speaking, top management and workers recognize the need for change and are willing to change. Middle management will do anything they can to prevent it, because they're the ones who really perceive themselves as being at risk.

The toughest problem is going to be getting support from that group. Except, if you start to demand change, the *best* of your middle managers, the *best* of your superintendents, will rally to your support, and you will begin to build a cadre of those who want to help.

Branscomb: I think the principle, clearly, is to push down the decisions on expenditures to meet purposes, down to the level where knowledge exists to make the decision.

I don't know quite how you would accomplish this, because of this middle management problem, but the ideal arrangement is to allocate to the schools the great preponderance of all the school budgets, and to ask the schools, then, to purchase services from the district that they require to do their jobs, and then give the teachers and the principal the option of absorbing the work themselves.

Many, many tasks that are done at headquarters could be done by teachers on a part-time basis. The teachers, of course, would bitterly resent being told they have to do these extra things on their own time in addition to all the paper grading and other tasks they don't get paid for now.

But if, instead, the game were different and the money was in the school, and the teachers sat around the table with the principal and said, "Okay, we have got three choices: we can buy the services from the district; or, if that is not an efficient way to get them, we can buy them from the private sector if somebody offers them; or we can do the work ourselves and take the money and use it to buy chalk for the blackboards and school books for the students, or whatever we need," you would find a lot of them trying to take that third path.

You would find the union, perhaps, resisting it, because they have got the work defined in the contract. But the school's incentive to behave like a professional institution and gain access to resources to deploy on education, against the union contract that protects them from work they don't want, is a tension we have to experience if we are going to deregulate.

Comment: I am the director of a development organization in Kentucky that is going to be doing more work here in West Virginia. And as we work on development issues, investing in small businesses, we keep coming back to education as the critical issue — no question about it. And this issue, about achievement orientation in the objectives of the system versus proscription about how teaching should be done, is at the heart of reform work . . . it keeps coming up no matter what the forum.

I would be interested in Dr. Godwin's analysis of what the obstacles are, from the point of view of an educator, to doing that, and to any discussion about models on any level (on a local level or in other states) that might give cause for optimism about being able to move in that direction.

Godwin: I think the problem that most states have is to raise standards to try and overcome the accumulated deficits of decades of educational lag. Questions of how you can put incentives into the schools for more local management, initiative, and deregulation, really have not commanded much of the attention, thus far, of education reformers.

That is because all of these states that I am talking about have large numbers of rural school systems, populated by disadvantaged families and children. They truly are trying to catch up with an age-old problem of an accumulated deficit in terms of just basic needs.

I think that will change. Clearly some of the large and well-to-do urban areas have much more concern for that. In a city such as Atlanta, although it is predominantly a minority school system, you will find some initial steps towards what you are talking about. Still we are dealing with a question of standards to raise the floor, so to speak, under the overall systems in these states.

Question: Our most valuable resource is our young people and keeping them in the state. **I am wondering, if, from K-12, a change in the curriculum towards the economy of the state in which they live, should not be very important in our education process, particularly in the higher grades? I am wondering, have you, in your work and in your surveys with other states, seen programs of this type evolve?**

What I am basically saying is that I feel very strongly that we must gear our young people toward the needs of our state in the hope that they will stay with us, be good productive citizens, and have excellent jobs in West Virginia.

Branscomb: I think there is a conundrum, and the conundrum is that you are absolutely right; that is what West Virginia ought to be trying to do. I believe that the curriculum that best does that is the same curriculum that gives those young people the best opportunity in Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, New York, or Montana. So the best thing you can do is give them all a good education, and do all the other things that will help to generate competitive opportunities for that education in West Virginia.

I do not think there is any way to specialize education to West Virgnia's unique economic activity, because the education students need is basic language skills, mathematical skills, and problem-solving, plus an appreciation of their culture and the fundamentals of how to keep a democracy surviving.

Question: **I would like to direct a question to Governor Smith. Are you going to have a call for action before we leave this conference and, if so, would you suggest a meeting of all those legislators present with Tom McNeel (Superintendent of Schools, West Virginia Department of Education)? Considering that we have the Finance Chairman here from the Senate and the Education Chairman from the House, could we ask for a commitment from those people present to address those forty-plus items that were identified that do not cost any money to implement?**

I would also ask that we add to the agenda of recommendations, 30-and-out — particularly for middle management principals. When we give them an opportunity to assist attrition, if you will, then we could recruit people based on standards you have identified to bring education to what it should be.

Smith: We called this conference to address the same questions that you asked. We are seeking to find how the Roundtable can cooperate and work with the Legislature and the Governor's office and those involved in state administrative portions of education, to develop a plan of action.

We had not contemplated that there would be a place to make recommendations before we left. However, I am not one to miss an opportunity, and we can certainly make arrangements for a brief meeting with those here who could perhaps help you do that; we would be delighted to.

The Roundtable's position in this matter is that we believe the improvement of the educational system, and what it produces, is most critical at this particular junction in our history. We want to devote what time and effort we can to help the Legislature and leaders of government to make those changes that they themselves see as most beneficial—not what the Roundtable particularly thinks about it.

The proposal under which we were operating was that we were going to print the records of this meeting, have a meeting later of our Task Force on Education, and then submit the findings of this group to the legislative interim committees so they could make a judgment as to what could be done and what couldn't be done.

I would urge you to have a meeting before we leave, and I think that, if you convene it, those members present would attend. Let's ask for a call to action. I think it would be a positive step.

IV. Keynote Speaker

Introduction

Hulett C. Smith
Chairman
Roundtable Task Force on Education

It is my pleasure to introduce several of our friends who have helped this conference be a success, and among those is Dr. Alvin Eurich, the President of the Academy for Educational Development, whose organization put this program together. With him are Sharon Franz, Vice President of School Services, and Melody Brooks. We want to express our thanks.

This Symposium gives me the opportunity to present those trustees of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation who see the role of education as a major component of a revitalization of West Virginia. The President of the Foundation, Mr. Henry Bergstrom, and Mrs. Bergstrom. The Executive Vice President, Paul Jenkins, and Mrs. Jenkins. We have with us the Vice President and Treasurer of the Foundation, David Wagner, and a consultant to the Foundation, Phil McGance. I could not pass this moment by without paying my deep respect and many thanks for the wonderful years Phil has given to the people of West Virginia and for his devotion to education. And we should particularly recognize Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia.

James Harless
Vice Chairman
West Virginia Roundtable, Inc.

Most generations of West Virginians produce at least one outstanding leader. Our speaker tonight is a product of my generation. His leadership ability was evident early in his undergraduate days at the University of Morgantown. He served in the United States Congress for three terms, representing the First District. In 1968 he decided that he could best serve his state by presenting himself as a candidate for Governor. In 1972, he was reelected and is now serving an unprecedented third term. Accomplishing this as a Republican in a predominantly Democratic state, speaks well of his leadership abilities. With his guidance and aggressive support of the House and the Senate, I'm sure that the goals we set for education in our state will be met. Ladies and Gentlemen, may I present to you the Honorable Arch A. Moore, Governor of West Virginia.

Keynote Speech

The Honorable Arch A. Moore, Jr.
Governor of West Virginia

Introduction

It is a great privilege to share in this Symposium on education. The uniqueness of this gathering is an indication that we recognize the challenge and change in our state of West Virginia. Our political persuasion makes little difference. Although committed to our respective philosophies, each of us recognizes the value of a symposium such as this.

I addressed the Governor's Scholars at West Virginia Wesleyan and was impressed by the brilliant young minds, representing the 55 counties of our state, and their desire and ability to explore the unknown, to search among things that were difficult to perceive and that were probably difficult to obtain. A majority came from modest circumstances, but they possess something that is necessary for success in this nation of ours, with all the abundant opportunities that we have, and that is a great, and a very well used mind.

I think I began to recognize the meaning of the Year of Education at Marshall University, addressing the Principals Academy. These were principals and school administrators who had decided to do something different about their career in education; they invested their own money and time to enroll in a significant course at Marshall University in school administration. And I'm advised that wherever you go in the elementary and secondary system in West Virginia, you automatically recognize those schools where the principal and administrator have participated in the Principals Academy that now functions so well in our state.

Earlier this week, I was privileged to attend another educational forum. Over 1,200 individual school administrators and teachers giving of their time, at their own expense, came to an educational leadership conference, displaying enthusiasm and asking for guidance from a distinguished panel of individuals working in the educational field. And tomorrow evening in this same gracious hotel, there will be another conference addressing higher education in the state of West Virginia.

A Decade of Education Reform

That ought to tell us all something. It ought to indicate that this is probably not the "year" of education, but the Decade of Education Reform in this state. While my office and the legislative leadership have addressed the economic deficiencies of our state and responded to them well, these mechanisms are now in place, and it's time to go beyond.

Here tonight, we gather at the invitation of the Benedum Foundation, to whom we look, in West Virginia, to respond to deficiencies in the quality of life in our state. They have joined with the Roundtable to invite members of the Legislature, both House and Senate, to make this educational symposium possible. I believe this point in time is altogether different from any other challenge or response that has been made in the field of education in the past. We've addressed many areas of life of our state and attempted to bring ourselves "up to speed," if I might use that term, on what really is going on across the country.

We can never allow ourselves to go back to the economic difficulties of the recent past. The manner in which we shed our individual desires and segmented interests to think about this state as a whole, will determine whether or not this has been a successful conference.

Opportunities have been met with a sense of dramatics. We're looking at a transition in the field of finance and banking today that is beyond the imagination of those that are involved in the field, much less those that look at it from the periphery. We are attempting, again, in this area, to come "up to speed," and to realize that there are significant things happening in the field of finance that we can no longer isolate ourselves from, however parochial we might be. As we have addressed economic development, as we've addressed finance and banking — an integral part of growth in any part of the country because of the capital resources needed to encourage growth — it is logical that we come to the area of education.

It is fair to say that no single area of the life of our state has been examined more. We have sought in no small degree to lay responsibility for deficiencies in education in our state at the breast of the educational system and the educator. If we have failed to compete and failed to progress, we say it's the fault of our educational system, when in fact, that is not a fair evaluation of educators or of the state of West Virginia's effort in this field. From this conference forward, in a spirit of cooperation, dispelling the individual tendencies and characteristics of advocating a position, or a side, or a view, we must merge our identities together, as we did in the area of economic development legislation, as we did in banking legislation in the field of finance, and as we must do in the field of education.

I suggest that these have got to be years of challenge and change, but they should take on an even greater sense of dramatics in that regard. We've got to look at education altogether differently, because these are different times.

West Virginian Leadership

Exciting and thought-provoking events are occurring in the field of education in many states, and West Virginians have not been content to follow. By tradition we have been leaders, although in many instances, our contributions have been covered over by a bushel. We have been leaders in the field of education, whether through the dialogue generated in the

Senate, or through those leaders we have recognized here tonight. You can recite many areas in which leadership, tendered by a West Virginian, was significant and impacted dramatically upon the life of this country in the field of education. We have got to distill all this.

This next legislative session truly must be devoted to education, and my administration will offer for the consideration of the Legislature a dramatic departure in the field of education.

Those who speak to an isolated sense of education will not like some of the suggestions. But in the times in which we live, we've got to get a better cost-benefit ratio out of this system. We are entering a time in which dollars will be in greater volume than they have been in the past, and we have to make sure that those dollars, however abundant they are, attack the problems at hand. We must dare to be different. We must do some things that are going to be shocking to the educational community and equally attention getting for the country. I think we have to apply the sense of dramatics that I speak of.

Experiment Stations

It is almost impossible to maintain in every one of our high schools the refinements of a classical education, the kind all of us have experienced. We must construct, whether in a single county or region, opportunities similar to what we offer in vocational education today, in such a way that the languages, math, and the sciences can flourish. These opportunities are not available in the high schools of the most rural part of our state, one of the most inaccessible portions of any in the country, and, in that respect, I think we should look at the idea of "experiment stations."

We used to do this in agriculture. We talked about agricultural experiment stations all over West Virginia because we were rural in context, rural in our thought, and certainly rural in our commitment. But we've got to have experiment stations in the field of education, and I believe our most talented teachers and professionals in the field of education will find this interesting. It will be a challenge to them and provide the opportunity to progress, an opportunity to move up the ladder of recognition of their educational capacities and ability. Not unnoticed will be the opportunity for better pay, and for participating in the economics of education.

Recognizing Excellence

What we've done in the past—and it is probably not to be faulted—is put everybody, good and bad, in the same category, treated them exactly the same. A good teacher got "X" number of dollars, or an "X" percent increase in pay. A poor teacher got the same wage and percent increase in pay. We have been unwilling to recognize excellence. It's sometimes been said that West Virginians tolerate excellence for a brief time, then they want to go back to the way the situation was in the past. But we simply have to recognize that there are excellent educators in this state, and we have to recognize some development of methodology that rewards that extra effort and undertaking.

Commitment to Education and Economic Development

I've mentioned economic development. Education and economic development are absolutely inseparable in the lives and times in which we live. Now, that is not to say people look at West Virginia and say, "Is your educational system better than the educational system of the adjoining state?" I don't think they do it that way. I think they go into comparisons because the manner in which a state addresses its educational deficiencies or accepts its educational challenge is a translation of the events of every senator, every lawyer, and every legislator. It is difficult, when you have a portfolio of economic development that you are attempting to sell to the people of West Virginia, to say that we do not believe sufficiently in education other than to give it a cursory, mandated, accepted, turn-of-the-century twist.

So, I suggest that you really commit yourself to a platform for the future of education in West Virginia. Whether you're a Senator or in the House, you're going to have this played off your chest constantly, because somebody will be suggesting that they know a better way than you. I daresay, none of us would deny the fact that our opportunities were given to us because of our education, an education we took advantage of.

Having said that, I think you've got to resist the parochialism and the provincialism that we know is here. It's a confession of faith, in a sense. We're home-grown people. We don't want to change if everything is right as we perceive it to be right. We're hard to sell any dramatics of change to. When we get the ox in the ditch completely, everybody focuses on the problem and cooperates until we get the ox out of the ditch, then we start fussing again.

I don't think we have to make an apology for our commitment to the field of education. The dollars we commit are indeed significant. The proportions of our general revenue budget are indeed significant by any comparison.

Where does West Virginia stand in relationship to the other states in the Southern Regional Education Board? Our highest participating area, in which we are marked the highest, is fourth among the fifteen states. The lowest we drop in those fifteen states is to seventh place. So, according to this data and to those accumulating this data, we do a respectable job. But I think we've got to go beyond.

Engineers use the term, "cost-benefit ratio," and, in those terms, I don't know that we are getting as much out of education that educators want to give us. That is, perhaps, our fault. I have talked to the members of our State Board of Education, who have the primary responsibility of program development for K-12, and of some of the adult education programs. They want to dare to be different. They recognize challenging areas that should be addressed, and they want to present some of these suggestions to the Legislature for their hearing.

I can tell you what usually will happen. We will say, "its new, its different, the bill's too long, the bill's too short," or "we haven't looked at this before," or "we really don't want to get into this now." I am simply saying that you are short-changing your constituents. Time is not on our side as it relates to reshaping the destiny and the future of this state. Out of this gathering tonight, and certainly from the leadership that is present here, we can surely summon the type of daring that it is going to take to move in the educational field.

Necessity of Dramatic Response

I remember putting together a task force on public education. Everybody thought that we were going to redefine education completely, when all we were trying to do was tell them where they could use their education dollars to get better value. Our purpose was not to take dollars away from education, but to teach them how they could get better benefit for the dollars that they had, whether they were purchasing school buses or providing a particular educational menu in the various counties. So I suggest that you shy away from any suggestion that, simply because its something that you haven't seen, it is different, and therefore lacking in merit.

I get things every day that I am seeing for the first time. Some I find exciting, some only modestly exciting. Others I read and lay aside. But you can't lay aside education in this state or any state. Any time you "pull up lame" in the field of education you have lost the momentum. Competition in the field of education is more intense than any of the industries that may be considered adversaries in this room tonight. Every state is in the business of attracting or of creating an educational climate that brings the most talented individuals to them. How many of you have said to yourself that we export too much of our talent? We talk about it generally as it relates to young people, but if we really localize it and talk about the field of education, we have exported more of our talented educators than would have occurred if we were paying attention to the true challenges of education.

I believe there is an innate desire to risk being different, regardless of what the political responsibilities might be. You're always going to get the sense that someone else doesn't have the vision that you have, doesn't have the daring that you have, doesn't have the willingness to be different that you desire to have. I suggest that you take out of this conference a feeling that we have an opportunity here, and we're not relating it specifically to the economics of education. We are talking about the broad face and the broad menu of education, whether in the elementary or secondary field, or in the field of higher education. If we do that, I think the future generation will realize that we dared to be different, that we looked at education in a different way, and did not bow in every direction to satisfy the constituency of the moment.

Anybody in political life in West Virginia today has taken on a daring responsibility. We are truly the leadership of this state. The business leadership, the benevolence, and foundation leadership is here. It's essentially in your hands and mine. I'm willing to take the chance. I hope you join me. Thank you very much.

V. Special Session

Recommendations for No-Cost Reforms

Smith: My suggestion yesterday was to play on an article that appeared in the *Charleston Gazette* a few days ago. The article featured the five most influential people in the state of West Virginia, and those five people are at this conference. Legislative leaders are here. If we can't leave with clearly defined goals and objectives, and with enough influence to get them accomplished and implemented, then the *Gazette* is absolutely wrong — and I don't believe that, because I've never found them to be wrong yet.

All of you have a copy of those ten things that were passed out. I would like Lyle Sattes to go down each item individually. He can tell us what we need to get involved in and what items on the list need a commitment from Tom McNeel to get involved in and implement.

Moderator: First, these are recommendations from a Council on Economic Development report, *Investing in Our Children*, and I commend that report to you. It's been a couple of months since I read it — but there are a lot more recommendations than what's before you right here. The first one on standards and performance measures would primarily be State Board rules, and we've done some of those things. The second one, about the honors department I've heard some discussion about, but I don't know if anything specifically has been done.

Response: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the document I will refer to this morning is something that we've mailed to each of you and talked to you about. That's the "1990 Targets, Expectations and Goals for Public Education." In this document, the State Board last February related where we hope to be in public education by 1990. The number one target is that every student who graduates from high school will meet or exceed certain standards.

Those expectations or criteria or competencies have not yet been defined, but we will move toward that and, hopefully, have that done by 1990.

We have talked about an honors diploma. At one time in this state, we had a merit diploma. When I graduated from Williamsburg High School here in Greenboro County, there were merit diplomas or regular diplomas depending on your grade point average. Certain criteria can be established there because, in my judgment, the minimum competency examination would make us more accountable. That's, also, what an honors diploma would do. It would show business people that the graduate you are about to employ is competent and qualified. Those who are more qualified and competent would be identifiable with respect to the honors awarded them. It is something that the State Board addressed yesterday.

Question: **Do we have two diplomas now?**

Response: We have only one diploma now. You either graduate with 21 credits or you don't graduate. That's all.

Question: **Then why would it take four years to get an honors diploma implemented?**

Response: It won't, as we look and develop. These are goals for 1990 and, hopefully, many can be implemented prior to 1990. So we need to be moving on that and will move toward establishing criteria for graduation and looking at an honors diploma. Some counties go beyond that right now. In your home county, you have a diploma that does recognize some students who have graduated, so to speak, with honors.

Question: **Couldn't that be implemented now, an honors diploma for all honors students graduating throughout the state, without all the rigmarole?**

Response: Yes. We can do that through the State Board as soon as possible.

Moderator: The next item on the list, parental responsibility, is really a statement of a change that's taken place in our whole society. I think most of us remember our parents being interested in what we did. I think, unfortunately, society has changed away from that. Maybe the Roundtable can have a bigger effect on reversing this change than anybody else because the report indicates that business could do this through its own methodology. But I really think all parents of children and all the rest of us encouraging everybody to do this is an essential thing.

Comment: Not only do we need businesses and parents to be more cooperative, but the schools could be more cooperative. As a parent who works, I understand this. The school system would not let me take my son fifteen minutes early. They wanted me to leave a first grader at home to catch the bus alone. If I could take him to school and know he's there and safe, my day was better. Schools don't cooperate with parents that are forced to work because of financial difficulties. We need some teamwork there.

Response: Yes, I agree that we have neglected in many respects the partnership that must be always there, and that is with the parent and with the business community, particularly with parents. If we're really going to be turning around public education, we need the full cooperation of both the school and the parent, and be flexible in those kinds of things. I've experienced similar conflicts, and schools have been too inflexible. Many educators have said to parents "leave us alone now, give us your children fifteen minutes later, and let us educate them then." We really need to change that mode of operation, and I say that together we can. The parent has the responsibility to do lots of things at home; but, needless to say, the school has to set the examples and provide the leadership about what's expected of that youngster and of that parent.

Comment: I think it's more the administrators. I've always thought that it wouldn't hurt the principals to spend a half hour with students in the morning, especially those who have to come early.

Response: I agree with the concept, certainly.

Moderator: The next item talks mainly about counseling functions. It's something that I think everybody in education has recognized as a necessity for a long time. Originally you found counselors — and you still do — primarily in secondary schools. The reason for that is that the national organization that accredits high schools mandated it. One of the people involved in that mandate, a member of the House now, Bob Kidd once said that they mandated it at the secondary level because that's the only place they had the power to — but that counseling really belonged at an earlier level.

About a year ago, we passed legislation requiring that counseling functions be provided in elementary schools. Now we didn't mandate that they have a counselor, but that counseling take place in the elementary schools. We did that primarily because the data from research indicates that it is even more important in elementary schools than it is in junior high schools. As this report indicates, those decisions are being made in junior high and middle schools. However, the objective data says that the decision to dropout is decided by the third or fourth grade. So counseling really needs to take place even earlier than that, and we're moving in that direction. The legislature could either decide to appropriate additional money, use the formula as a method of mandating it, or other methods. We've been consistent with our willingness to appropriate money and administrators' with their willingness to make decisions. We have encouraged that, but we could do more if we wanted.

Response: We certainly agree that guidance activities are very important at the early age and have developmental guidance in our curriculum at the present time. We additionally have in our targets for 1990 for every school — that by the eighth grade level, the parent, the counselor, and the student will sit down and chart out a four-year plan of activities that will lead to graduation. So the parent is involved early on, at least at that point in career choices, in planning what is necessary for that youngster to take in high school to go on to college — if that's the expectation — to enter the job market, and certainly to graduate from high school. But it's very important also because the legislation changed the role of counselors. They were previously, in many cases, administrators instead of counselors. The change has been beneficial.

Moderator: Part of the problem here is that when you mandate the way our formula is established — we're putting money in based on people — if you mandate that they have counselors, and that those counselors have half or full time, then you're taking away personnel that they have someplace else. Now, you could take it out of the administrative levels, which we would get a lot of complaints about, or out of the teachers level, which you get other types of complaints about. But you can reallocate resources, and you don't necessarily have to invest more money. There are several ways to deal with it, but you also have to deal with what the effect is of what you do on the positive and negative side.

Smith: I think the point that we in the legislature have to understand is that this one is going to be a little difficult for us to take on because we're going to be messing with the teacher-pupil ratio. When you leave here with all the recommendations saying that we need to do something in this area, we need a commitment from you that you will support some changes in this area when you get to Charleston.

Question: During the school year, my wife tutors two children in the sixth grade. Those children were reading on about the first grade level. **The question is, why were they advanced?**

Response: That's a good point, Senator Holmes. I don't have the answer to that, but I can simply say, personally, that we ought not to be doing that. We ought to be providing remedial education at the early grades, regardless of whether they're in a Chapter I federally funded program, providing successes, and building on those successes, not having automatic promotions. Forget a little bit about the health, social studies, and the science, and so forth at the early grades, and concentrate on reading and basic skills in mathematics — this is how we're really going to build on success.

Remedial education is one of our targets for 1990. It will cost some money. But remediation has got to start early, in my judgment. And it's got to be under special circumstances, with special people, teacher aides, tutors, and others helping boys and girls, if we're really going to keep them in school and if they're going to be literate and have the job skills and work habits that are necessary. It's a very good point.

Question: **Who has the overall responsibility to see that automatic promotions don't happen?**

Response: The responsibility would rest with the school principal. You heard Governor Moore last night talking about the leadership role of the school principal, and the expectations that the principal has established through the cooperation of staff, teachers, and parents for that school. This would certainly relate to it. We have to identify those youngsters early. Sometimes learning disabilities cause those things to happen. We have to identify this early through testing and counseling and special education. But we've got to do it early. It's too late in the sixth grade, without a doubt.

Moderator: The next item has to do primarily with deregulation. When I first read this report I was excited about possibilities in this area. I think we want to be sure about the possibility of success in a situation like this. And so I would lean in the direction of devising a program where a small number of our best school districts, whole counties, who volunteered for the program first of all, would then compete for the program. We would select some of those counties that would likely be successful. The legislature could then pass legislation that would take away all the regulations. Now there are a lot of regulations. It's primarily the legislature that does it, and it's primarily done in order to keep in line the bottom ten or fifteen counties. So we could reverse it and let the high flyers have more flexibility.

I'm definitely for attempting to do that if you all are willing to support it, because I think it could be successful. This could also tend to pull along the bottom ones because once they see that a really good job can be done, then they've got possibilities. But I think you want to be sure that you are working with people who have the capability to handle that, because there's a lot of additional work as well as freedom. With freedom comes responsibility, and those counties will have a lot of additional responsibility.

Response: Just a brief response to Lyle. That is to say that the State Board, as well, will have to look at some of our extensive regulations, many of which were promulgated, of course, pursuant to legislative statute on accreditation. We would be interested in looking at it jointly with the legislature. But at the same time we have to have some way to put pressure on those who aren't doing well, to keep them in line or get them in line so that you don't have the problems occurring.

Comment: I think that we have to take into consideration the political ramifications there also, as well as parental involvement and responsibility. In many of our areas, the mystery of education or the educational mystique has been promoted by those in power in the educational system, as we have discussed. The people have been so shut out from the process that they really don't know how to manage the system themselves. This means that it's pretty much left to the Board and the Superintendent without a lot of voter and parental involvement. Again, as Lyle Sattes said, there are fourteen or fifteen counties, or maybe fewer, that cause many of the regulations to be mandated. That is because the school board has become a political animal instead of simply being the representative of people. Now I don't know how you address that, but I do think the pilot program suggested by Lyle is excellent.

But again, how are you going to address the problem also of the sacred cow? (RESA) has a lot of responsibilities and a lot of highly-paid former administrators. That is a place where those jobs are given out. They're not going to like it if counties can bypass them and do their own buying and so forth. I think you're going to have a lot of resistance from a lot of areas. I think this is the direction we've got to go, but don't think it's going to be easy, politically.

Comment: No question. Just a suggestion. I do think that we must include parents in this decision.

Smith: **To get back to this one here, did I hear the Chairman of Education in the House say that he would**

introduce legislation in the next session to address this problem and that we want those members of the legislature who are going to be back next year to sign on? Is that a reasonable statement of what happened here?

Response: That is the way to go.

Moderator: We can use the interim process to help develop some legislation that will be more broadly representative of the will of the number of legislators; one legislator introducing legislation isn't quite as helpful. But I think we can use the interim process, and we can definitely do that.

Smith: Those of you who are in the legislature now, as she pointed out, it's not going to be easy. But you didn't ask people to send you to Charleston so you could vote on easy issues. So, when you leave here, tell these people as you go out the door that you're going to support the concept.

Moderator: The next item has to do with different areas of teacher preparation. We had some discussion of that. You have the Carnegie report, and there are a lot of other reports. I could fill a shelf with reports on what we need to do on teacher preparation, and there's a lot of differences of opinion. I think we're going to be taking a look at it, but one thing we have to be cognizant of as we look at teacher availability in the future is that the quality of the people going through education programs to become teachers today is abominable. When you start talking about sorting out some of the ones we got now who aren't particularly good, remember that they're probably better than the pool that you'll have to draw from.

We have a national tragedy in the making here, and I think we ought to be very careful about what we do in that regard because everybody assumes that you can go out and hire high quality teachers. The truth of the matter is that it's exactly the opposite. You will have a great deal of difficulty finding high quality teachers. Salary is a major factor. One of the problems that I see from my position is that every time you get a recommendation for teacher salary increases, obviously those who support it most are the teachers' groups. It's no mystery why that would be. But then I get from legislators, as well as business people — it's those greedy teachers again.

The fact of the matter is, if we implemented every major recommendation at the original level, not at what we usually reduce them down to, we still wouldn't be in the ball game in terms of competitiveness. So if the teachers' groups come in and lobby for it, it makes common sense. You would too if you were a teacher. But we have to get away from the concept that whatever we're trying to do is because of greed, when the truth of the matter is we aren't even approaching greed, we're approaching bottom level situations. Our attitude is part of the problem. It's exacerbated sometimes by the attitudes of some of the people who lobby us. And let me tell you, anything that you have ever had any teacher say to you, I've had it in spades. So I know what kinds of attitudes are fostered, but we just have to recognize reality. The money is not enough, and we need to do something about it. And it takes probably fifteen years for it to show up the way we'd like it to show up.

Response: The issue addressed in the recommendation relates to taking an A.B. degree, first, before going into teacher preparation programs. I think that's something that needs to be looked at with Dr. Cole and with our educational institutions across West Virginia in terms of the availability of personnel. Certainly you have to have competent people teaching the subject matter. They have to be trained and skilled in the subject matter, and we have moved, through State Board policy in the last three years, to guarantee that in a four-year program. Every student who went into a teacher preparation program last fall must now jump through three competency-based hoops in order to be a teacher. One, they have to pass a competency-based basic skills examination before they can get into the teacher education program. Secondly, once they get in they have to pass a competency-based examination in the subject matter. And third, they have to pass the competency, proficiency appraisal in terms of performance, student teaching, and classroom experience. So, there are now three additional hoops beyond regular classroom. Mr. Sattes is exactly right, however, on basic salaries. They have to be increased, and our concept there has to change. I think that the governor is also right as he talked last night about developing ways of rewarding excellent teachers. But we've got to raise basic salaries in addition, so it's more complex than it seems at first.

Moderator: Let me make one more short comment. Tom McNeel just mentioned that we're asking them to jump through hoops before they become teachers. Then after they've got their college degree and the additional education they know is required from the start, we start them off at fourteen or fifteen thousand dollars. Business people, who have done some recruiting, know how difficult it is to find qualified people to go through those kinds of hoops. How many could you get for a teacher's salary? Well, the interesting part is that we're more competitive at the starting salary level than we are later on. That shows you how big the problem is.

Smith: **Do you have this in your by-1990 plan? Is there any phasing in of this in your objectives?**

Response: The goals for 1990 reflect increases and compensation and look at some school-based incentives — performance rewards — that would be considered by the legislature, by us, and recommend by the Governor's office as well.

Smith: **Would you agree that this must be an initiative on the part of the State and the Governor's office, and would you commit to these people here that you will start in that direction?**

Response: Yes, I will do that. In fact, my board has been looking at incentive pay for a number of years now. But at the same time we recognize that a basic increase in salary is the highest priority, and that we have to look at equity in terms of salaries across the state and competition from outside the state. When you have a teacher in Jefferson County, who can go across the border and make eight thousand dollars more doing the same job, you're going to lose those people.

Comment: I seem to be the one who brings up the difficulties we face, but as legislators we merely reflect what the general public wants done. There have got to be some quid pro quos when you bring salary levels up to the level that most the teachers deserve. I think one of the problems is that the general public sees a few poor teachers, and there is no way at this point to get rid of these poor teachers. They equate all teachers that way and are unwilling to pay them at the level they should have. So, I think we're going to have to look at something there also.

Moderator: The next item is academic competence as a requirement for getting into a vocational program, and I wholeheartedly support that. I think it would reverse the concept, that was mentioned the other day, that vocational schools are used as dumping grounds. Instead, the regular school system ought to keep students until they can get to the level where they can do vocational work. And I think that we ought to do that.

Response: I agree wholeheartedly, because of the work habits discussed yesterday afternoon by Mr. Butler, but also in terms of literacy. We're looking at remediation programs and doing some of that at vocational centers right now, but they ought to be literate before they get there. The same is true with adult retraining programs. Many of our school districts — and we're encouraging it — require that before adults go back in to be retrained for another job, they also have to be literate in terms of basic skills.

Smith: **Can the School Board address this on an administrative level, or do you see some legislative action reform?**

Response: I think it's basically administrative level in terms of what the State Board is about and what we're doing. We'll look at it.

Moderator: Cooperative education is another area for the State Board. If they need assistance from us, we can certainly discuss it.

Response: I think that is true in terms of cooperative education. That's defined in the school system, generally speaking, as "on-the-job training for vocational students in cooperation and partnership with business people." Again, it points out the need for closer cooperation in building partnerships with parents first, then with the business community directly and indirectly.

Comment: Most people, including administrators, parents, and students do not understand the basic principles of capitalism or the free enterprise system. These principles run right to the heart of production efficiency, profit, etc., and there are many myths out there that are not clearly understood by the public. If the educational system doesn't show the pros and cons, the virtues and non-virtues of these various items that I've mentioned, then we're not going to have the proper work attitudes. Academics should appreciate the problems of employers.

Response: Certainly, but some three years ago the State Board changed its graduation requirements to include economics for half a semester at the junior or senior year. In addition to that, we've been working with the Council for Economic Improvement in West Virginia to bring —to the school curriculum, and to school teachers, and to retrain teachers — curriculum materials related to economics and to the free enterprise system as it works in our democracy.

Attitudes have changed. There's a world of difference bringing up a fourteen-year-old today than when I was a fourteen-year-old, growing up on the farm. There was plenty for me to do then. I learned work habits from my father because we worked every afternoon and every morning before going to school. That's not true today, and we've got to cultivate that work ethic and work habits beyond what we used to do. We've neglected that, and we've got to get back to it. And that includes an awareness of the whole system as you're talking about.

Comment: With reference to parental responsibility, there are cultural problems that relate to West Virginia. One thing that was brought up yesterday was the preschool programs for three-year-olds that prevented other things from developing, such as a high dropout rate at the high school level, and remediation for sixth graders reading at a first grade level. I think the parental responsibility is to address the attitudes. The business community could help somewhat through a public information campaign. We also have to address this in the area of preschool programs for those people. And I think that everything we're talking about gets back to that cultural situation.

Response: I might comment that she is talking about three- and four-year-old preschool education for high risk children. Our State Board has talked about that, and we wholeheartedly agreed that it is a good investment. You're talking about four to one return on your money, which is absolutely true in our judgment. We support that, we have discussed it with parties across the states, and we will be making a proposal in that respect.

Comment: Once you get the right attitude there, you're not going to have the problems we talked about later on.

Moderator: The next item mentions transition years—junior high school—and talks about additional research in order to develop programs. A lot of research is available, and we've been using our committee staff to do literature reviews and devise policies in this area. I think we'll continue to do that, but I don't think it calls for anything specifically new.

Response: Just make note. Many of you have heard of middle schools in West Virginia. Traditionally, it was either K-12, or 1-6 and 7-12, or 7-9 with a junior high. Some years ago the State Board and the Department—all on the basis of research in developmental levels of youngsters — moved all curriculum materials and programs to three levels: early childhood level, which is kindergarten through the fourth grade, an area of development that is unique and of itself as those of you who are parents know. Then grades 5, 6, 7, and 8, being a middle childhood learning level, or adolescent level, when children are completely different from the early level or late, high school level.

We have tried to programmatically address those three levels, regardless of whether you're in Harmon, Pickens, or Randolph County with K-12, or whether you're in another county with K-6, 7-9, or 10-12, or whether you truly have middle schools. What we have tried to say is that the middle childhood years are ultra-important, and you need to teach and react with those students differently than with high school students and with early childhood. That's not what we're moving towards, not to have middle schools everywhere. That's not the intent. We simply say that teachers and administrators must be aware of the developmental level of youngsters and provide circumstances and an environment to enhance those learning levels.

Moderator: The next item, high school performance, talks about cooperative education, which was already mentioned. I also take that as a call for programs like Adopt-a-School, which several counties are into now, and hopefully the business community will get involved with more. To some extent, these are in my county, and hopefully they will do more, not only at the public education level but also in higher education.

Comment: From a business standpoint, we stand ready to participate more fully in Adopt-a-School and Adopt-a-Principal programs. They are extremely important.

Response: I'd simply suggest that, for our targets for 1990, every school in West Virginia, all 1200 schools, have a business partner. Basically, not so much for what business can offer in terms of materials, personnel, and resources, but to learn about each other. Because, certainly, if all you know about the little elementary school in your neighborhood is what you see when you drive by and what people tell you, you're not going to be able to make it better. But by getting to know each other better, we will then appreciate each other better and can support each other with what we're all doing. We're suggesting that every school ought to have at least one business partnership and individual partnerships with every parent.

Moderator: The last item is financing education. We have taken a step by implementing the reappraisal that will make a substantial difference. There are a lot of other problems in financing schools, and one I hope we'll deal with shortly. That's the excess levy problem, because as the reappraisal is implemented, the excess levy problem will get substantially greater. We tried to deal with this problem with an amendment to the Constitution in 1984, and that failed. It only got 45 percent of the vote and we needed 51 percent. But I hope we'll try a more successful approach. It's essential.

This particular recommendation also talks about leaving local leeway. This could be done by allowing a small amount of excess levy election — which is not a bad idea at all. Sometimes the courts don't like it, but if it's not an overwhelming amount of money, it can still be very meaningful. We also do the local decision-making level already, since 1981 when we established step seven of the formula. Local counties decide how that money is spent. There is a great deal of oversight by the State Board and the State Department of Education to make sure that they aren't wasting money on things that are not helpful to the instructional process. It is a local decision-making process, and it gets larger, generally, every year. Maybe Tom McNeel would like to comment about that. I'd like for Senator Spears to go ahead first, perhaps. She's in charge of all the money.

Response: First of all, I think there are several problems that we have to recognize. One of them, industry can play a great part in, particularly in partnership with state government as far as economic development is concerned. I represent a very rural area, and all seven of my counties have very low per capita incomes, just a little over $6,000 a year, even though these people are making sincere efforts. It is hard for them to equate paying a fair salary to teachers with that per capita income. Also, there is a dearth of skilled labor jobs in rural West Virginia. About the only skilled labor jobs that you could count on in the rural parts were coal-related jobs, and these, of course, are decreasing.

So, we have to address not just economic development anyplace in West Virginia—while that certainly is to be commended—but the special needs of the rural areas. Also, I'm wondering if perhaps we don't need some innovative types of financing for education. I think that as long as property taxes are the main source, you are going to find a certain amount of resistance to pay more and more, because that segment of society feels a little put upon at times. I think that what we need is a joint task force between the executive and the legislative bodies, that addresses not only the problems of education, but will explore innovative ways of financing education, rather than our traditional way of generally placing the burden on the property owner. I think there are a lot of other states that do it differently, or have a combination of taxes. The children of West Virginia are everybody's children, and we all should be willing to pay our fair share in educating those children. It is up to us to point the way. So I suggest that we have a task force formed by the Governor and by legislative leaders that looks into innovative financing.

Response: I agree first of all that everybody ought to pay their fair share, whatever that is, and whatever method you might use. I'm skeptical, quite frankly, about some additional ways to raise revenue. I don't know that much about taxation in general across the state, but I know that from what I've read and understand, that other methods of taxation used to finance the general revenue in our state are almost exhausted, in terms of sales tax, personal income tax, and other things that we might use. I would say that we need to have across West Virginia a system of finance that undergirds the whole structure of education, so that youngsters growing up in Rock Ranch and Almond County, or in Williamsburg and Greenburg County, or in Wheeling and Ohio County, or Charleston County, ought not to be disadvantaged because of where they grow up. They ought to have equal opportunity. That's coupled with, in my judgement, quality education. Boys and girls should have the opportunity to succeed and to have this chance to do as well as their counterparts across the state of West Virginia, because we have a state system of public education.

I think as we look at whatever this takes—in terms of a task force or whatever else — that we have to be more accountable, that we have to develop partnerships with business and community leaders, with parents and others, and that we have to insist on high quality. We've got to do those things, and I would suggest that we ought not to do anything piecemeal, that we ought not to say we're going to do this little thing this year, and this little thing next year, but we ought to develop some program that we can build upon. There might be some give and take with the system, with administrators, with teachers, and others, but only to be more accountable, so that we can say to the general public, you're going to get more for your money; you're going to have better teachers; you're going to have better children with better basic skills. We need to say to those folks that quality will improve and we will only do that with your help and with your assistance. Build a complete program, a package that will include these ten things and others that go beyond this list, that won't cost a whole lot, but which have to be done to create a quality school and a quality student for the business community and the citizens of West Virginia. The leaders of tomorrow are the youth of today, and we've got to build on that.

Smith: A couple of brief comments in addition to this list. Mr. Butler's comments yesterday about illiteracy and the three-year-old had a very profound effect on me. I never realized how dramatic it was and how it was so identifiable. And I wondered, if we're doing anything to address that issue, that needs to be included on our list here. Can you provide us with some direction so we can look at it in the next session of the legislature, to put a mechanism in place, whatever is required, to identify those people to try to get them off the merry-go-round, if you will.

Response: We would be happy to do that. It's going to cost you a few dollars. At the same time, we need to break the cycle.

Smith: There are not too many investments that I've seen where you can get a four-to-one return.

Response: That's exactly right.

Smith: The other issue I would like to see discussed is this: I personally think there is a lot of merit to "thirty years and out," so that we can get some new blood into the educational system, particularly in administrative positions. What is your comment on that?

Response: I'm assuming you mean thirty years of experience and not thirty years of age. There is some merit to that idea. You moved in the Legislature about early retirement, with 30 years regardless of your age, and being able to retire with the teachers' retirement system. I think that's a step in the right direction. I would hasten to add that I've seen some mighty fine people who have more than 30 years experience, particularly teaching, and others who are administrators, who are strong administrators and do a fine job. I think we get lackadaisical people sometimes, both in the classroom and in administration, those who have risen as far as they're going to rise and just maintain that. The primary responsibility, I think, goes back to the county board, the county superintendent, and those superiors to that principal or that principal to those teachers. We have got to relight the fires or else get rid of them. We have already addressed this to some extent, but not as well as it should be.

Question: **I would like to know what happened to the million dollars that was appropriated for handicapped children?**

Response: The question deals with three- and four-year-old severely handicapped children, and what happened to the million dollars. If you divide the million dollars by 55 counties, you get 18,000 dollars across the state. You're not going to get a whole lot of service for 18 thousand dollars for the four-year-old. But, last year all severely handicapped four-year-old children were identified. This year they will be provided direct services, either in the home or by bringing them into the school environment for special education services for the severely and profoundly handicapped.

Moderator: I could get into philosophy, but won't. Keep in mind the factual things about financing of our school system. One is this: in terms of property tax support for education — even after the reappraisal is put into effect — West Virginia will be one of the lower states in dependence on property taxes for its school system. Right now, before the implementation of the reappraisal, approximately 20 percent of the support of the public school system comes from property taxes. There are jurisdictions where it's 100 percent. So, we've generally

82

been very low in the percentage of money that goes into the school system from property taxes. We will still be fairly low even after the reappraisal. Even if we implemented an excess levy at a 100 percent rate, we would still be one of the lower states in terms of dependence on the property tax.

That means we're depending substantially on general revenues. And I tend to agree with what McNeel says, that our flexibility on general revenues is not great. Anybody will tell you that we're about to the limit on every rate you'd want to set. We're among the top states. We may even have to move in the direction of trying to lower the personal income tax, which I hope we can. But still we're very limited in our general revenues, and that's the main fight that we had in deciding whether to dedicate general revenues for roads or not. Some were for it and some against. But, anyway, that will be the major question about flexibility for future funding, not only for education but other things in state government. What availability do we have in general revenue? Not much, is the answer, in my judgment.

VI. Symposium II

Symposium II: Speakers

Current State Efforts to Improve Education

Dennis P. Doyle
Hudson Institute
Co-author of *Excellence in Education*

Introduction

The work I've done really falls into two big phases. One had to do with the book you've been discussing this morning, *Investing In Our Children*. I was privileged to be the project director for the Committee for Economic Development's study and found that a fascinating and satisfying experience. At the same time, I was able to co-author a short book that has also been referred to, *Excellence in Education: The States Take Charge*. That was an outgrowth of a series of seminars held at the American Enterprise Institute, involving: Lamar Alexander, Governor of Tennessee; Chuck Robb, then Governor of Virginia; Bill Honig, Superintendent of Public Instruction in California; and Jack Gordon, President Pro Temp of the Florida Senate. The second round of meetings involved Bill Brock, Secretary of Labor, and Pete Dupont, Governor of Delaware. We explored the waters to find out what we could about their views on state reform, state change, and the movement we regard as states seizing the initiative. The strengths of the study are due to the contributions of these people.

A Static Federal Role

We are convinced that we are watching a major transformation in American Education. The Great Society ushered in a very vigorous and active federal role, principally in the area of civil rights — activities that were long overdue and necessary. We had begun to think, many of us, that this was the norm. But it is clear to us now, looking backwards, that the 20-year period of major federal activity was probably an aberration, and that the more natural cycle of American political life is the federal system, in which the states and localities seize and take the initiative. It is clear to us that this is reemerging as the pattern for the foreseeable future, certainly to the end of the century.

The question of course is why? Why did federal initiative peak in the early 80's after only two decades? The answer, superficially at least, has to do with major changes in domestic priorities at the national level, that is, our conviction, rightly or wrongly, that the federal government could not be all things to all people, that it could not do as much as it had done in the past, that its ambitions were too great, and that of necessity the federal government would scale back on the domestic front. Budget cuts, of course, are now history.

It is ironic that, although the Reagan Administration made heroic efforts to cut the education budget, the cuts never materialized in any consequential fashion. The rate of growth did stop, but Mr. Reagan campaigned—if you remember in 1984—as the President who had signed the largest education budget in history. That was true, although not by design. The budget sent forward by OMB had intended to cut education, but the U.S. Congress would not do so, and, in a strong bipartisan effort, they held the line. It seems to suggest that Washington is prepared to do just so much, not prepared to add very much more, and not prepared to cut very much. The federal role is probably static as far as we can see into the future. This, of course, is also exacerbated by the deficit. And it will be impossible for anyone in the White House to seriously propose major increases in federal domestic spending so long as the deficit looms over us. I think that it is going to be that way until the end of the century.

Competition for Resources

As well, there is intense competition for scarce resources, particularly on the domestic front. You will remember that 19 years ago, when Medicare/Medicaid was still a gleam in the eye of planners, they predicted that if it were enacted by the late 1980's, it might cost eight or possibly nine billion dollars a year. It's now costing 87 billion dollars a year, and the meter is still running. It is simply that other social services are making demands with which education must compete and compete very vigorously.

The "New" New Federalism

The Reagan Administration, when it first came to Washington, thought that its most important domestic initiative would be New Federalism or, if you like, "New" New Federalism, since Mr. Nixon's New Federalism had failed. The conventional wisdom is that Mr. Reagan's federalism failed as well: water in the sand. As a formal matter that is true. It was abandoned. Governors and state legislators, who negotiated with the Office of New Federalism in the White House, went home convinced that no New Federalism proposals could be drafted. To that end the office was closed. The director of that office is now working in Chicago, and it seems to be a fading memory.

I would suggest, however, that analytically, New Federalism has come to pass, as a de facto or do-it-yourself New Federalism. The hot potato has been passed to you, not so much by design but by oversight, not so much by commission but by omission. You are, as it were, left holding the New Federalism bag.

This would have been a disaster twenty or thirty years ago, because the capacity of state governments to deal with issues of this kind was severely limited. Legislatures and governors' offices did not have then the sophistication, the capacity to manage large amounts of data, the analytic ability, the sort of intellectual, political, and institutional infrastructures to deal with large, complex, and stormy problems. It seemed, for a long time, that it was appropriate for Washington to do these things.

But, almost unnoticed over the past twenty years, there has been a true revolution in competence in state governments across the country, almost without exception. I am reminded, of course, of Lester Maddox' famous comment that he couldn't improve his prisons without a better class of prisoner. Well, our state legislators and governors have clearly been improved by both a better class of legislator and a better class of governor. It is an extraordinary list in only the last five years. I look especially to the South, in part because of where I live and where I am today, but I think also for objective reasons.

Education Leadership from the South

Traditionally we have looked to the Northeast and the Far West for leadership. It is significant that neither New York or California, my home state, has offered much leadership in education reform in the past four or five years. Those states have really issued deafening silences in education reform. Education reform has come from the South, from Bob Graham in Florida, from Riley in South Carolina, from Alexander in Tennessee, from Clinton in Arkansas, from White in Texas, from Hunt in North Carolina. It's a remarkable list of people, and I mention them by name because it is clear to me that education reform requires absolute prodigies of leadership.

This leadership has been offered by state legislators and governors, most notably in the South over the past five years. And it is a good omen for the future.

Now this revolution in competence, in itself, would not have been sufficient to bring about reforms; rather, we have the opportunity or the means to bring about reform by virtue of the revolution in competence. But, as Agatha Christie fans know, you also need a motive if you're to solve a crime or to commit one. In this case, the motive for state legislators and governors and for the business community which supported reform was very simple and straightforward. It had to do with economic growth, economic development, economic well-being.

Economic Motives for Reform

I began to track this two or three years ago. I was rather suspicious and cynical about it, thinking perhaps this was simply campaign rhetoric, so much talk to rally the troops. But in examining the issue across the nation, I am convinced that the nation's governors and state legislators do believe that our economic well-being depends upon a healthy and vigorous school system. It is obvious, at least to academics, that that's true. Human capital, as we like to call it—the acquired skills, abilities, attitudes, and knowledge of people—is the nation's wealth. Adam Smith, in *The Wealth of Nations*, made this observation three centuries ago, and it has never been more true.

The Japanese Educational System

In emerging post-industrial societies of the developed world, people's knowledge and abilities are, in fact, the wealth of the nation. This is driven home forcefully and dramatically when we compare ourselves to our most effective competitor, the only country in the history of the world to ever out-compete America, Japan. Japanese kids go to school 240 days a year, our kids go 180 days. Japanese students have the highest test scores in the world in almost every category of measurement. Japanese mean IQ has increased seven to 10 points over the past two decades, the only time in history that we know of in which such an event has occurred. Ninety-eight percent of Japanese youngsters graduate from high school, notwithstanding the fact that compulsory attendance only goes to age 16. Japanese students are taught to cooperate and work together. There are almost no janitors in Japanese schools, and no graffiti on Japanese school walls, because Japanese youngsters clean their own classrooms. Japanese students study not just mathematics and science, the quantitative disciplines that are important in the modern post-industrial society. They also study art, music, history, calligraphy, tradition, and a second language.

These things are important because they were brought about by deliberate design. They are not accidents of history or accidents of culture. The Japanese education system is clearly the product of three major waves of reform; the first, after the restoration in the 1870's, was ushered in by the introduction of a group of American consultants. In the same way that the Japanese took over the camera market, the automobile market, the TV market, and every other market that you can think of, they moved in education by getting the best advice they could. They got advisors from Rutgers and were told, essentially, to create a network of highly selective, high-demand schools which would serve the leaders of the next generation. This they did, and they did it very well.

The second wave of reform was imposed upon the Japanese by General MacArthur when he occupied the islands. He told the Japanese they must democratize all the facets of their lives, including their schools. They agreed to this, subject to one proviso, that they would not lower their standards. They would bring the bottom up to the top. Japanese students today labor under what is called by the Japanese themselves "a passion for equality," a situation which is very demanding for the slower student, disappointing in some respects for the brightest students, but it has produced a phenomenon never before seen, at least in academic research. That is, that Japanese test scores cluster around the mean. There are very few outliers. They are literally bringing the bottom up to the top, and it's an extraordinary development.

The third wave of Japanese reform is now under way, being overseen by Mr. Ishi of Bridgestone Tires. He is determined to introduce the best practices that America has to offer into Japanese education, to remedy the manifest weaknesses of Japanese education, which are numerous and serious. In interviewing Mr. Ishi, I asked him what he would do as his first reform. He said, introduce the Socratic method. Japanese students don't get a chance to ask questions. They don't get a chance to interact. Japanese education creates intellectual discipline, not intellectual creativity.

I say the last because it is very important to remind ourselves that we could not, if we wanted to, imitate the Japanese. What they do is unique to their culture and their traditions. But we can follow their lead in one important way, by remembering that our schools can be made to do what we think is socially important and socially useful. Our schools can do for us, in terms of our traditions, our culture, our interests, our objectives, what the Japanese have set out to do with their schools. Now it is true that if the Japanese combine the best of our schools—a sense of entrepreneurship, creativity, innovation, flexibility, adventure—then they will, in fact, have the best education system in the world. And then it really will be "watch out."

The California Business Roundtable

It would be useful to discuss a couple of reforms that have special interest and bearing on West Virginia, both for state legislators and the business community. The first has to do with the work of the California Business Roundtable, which may be known to some of you. It is the single most important reform effort ever launched in California, and it was wholly the brain child of the California Business Roundtable.

They created it under the leadership of Cornell Meyer, carried it forward, and raised substantial amounts of money to fund significant studies which were then used to convince key legislators and the Governor to adopt a major set of linked reform strategies, which are now in place or unfolding. The CED report, which Owen Butler spoke about, did commission the paper which describes it in some length, and I am sure we could arrange to get a copy of that to you.

The Excellence Movement

Secondly, it seems important to remember what the excellence movement is all about. It should guide any policy decisions that you, as legislators or as business representatives, advocate or support. Excellence and its characteristics are almost, by definition, beyond the reach of Washington, and I think almost beyond the reach of state capitals, except in the most limited sense. I suggest to you that excellence is home grown. It reflects a community of scholarship, or to use the jargon of education researchers, the "school ethos." We're talking about shared purpose, shared values, shared intellectual values, an orderly learning environment, high standards for teachers and students, measurable goals, recognized accomplishments, and also recognized failure. In short, morale, purpose, and dedication.

You cannot buy these values with money. Money certainly doesn't hurt; it may even help the process. But these values have to emerge organically from the school. Curriculum, textbooks, conditions of work, hiring, firing, and morale are all local issues which can be supported and encouraged by the state, but which cannot be mandated by edict or fiat. And that brings me to my conclusion in terms of the recommendations you were talking about this morning, and the comments that Owen Butler made yesterday.

The Single Most Important Reform

What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, as I see it. Five states across the nation have adopted what they call "school bankruptcy law." If a school fails to meet its intellectual, academic, or vocational obligations to its students, it will be declared bankrupt and put into a sort of intellectual or academic receivership, to be reorganized, restructured, and operated in such a way that it does meet its obligations to its clients.

Now if academic receivership is a reasonable proposal, which I think it is, so then is a systematic and serious approach to school deregulation—lifting the heavy hand of bureaucracy from those schools which, by whatever measures you choose to adopt, do meet their obligations to their communities. Give them flexibility, as a modern corporation would any of its divisions; give them the flexibility to meet their obligations as they think they are best suited. They certainly have the skill and energy to move forward. I would commend that to you as the single most important reform you can consider. It is a complex reform, deceptively simple in its presentation. Implementation would require both imagination and hard work, but I think it is well within reach. And I think we will see other states begin to explore it.

Conclusion

The best thing, I suppose, to conclude about Washington's gradual withdrawal from the education scene, is that we are going to see fifty flowers bloom. We will see fifty different reform ventures by the fifty states. They will have different personalities and different characteristics. It will, of course, keep people like me in business because we'll have plenty to analyze, but it will also mean that legislators and business leaders who care about education, will have available models of good practices, mistakes, and accidents to learn from to help shape the future. I think that West Virginia can, if it takes some of these reform proposals seriously, provide serious and sustained leadership in the field of education reform which will be a hallmark in West Virginia and in the nation as a whole.

The Press and Education Reform

Edward Fiske
Education Editor
The New York Times

Introduction

My previous incarnation, before becoming education editor, was as religion editor. People often ask how I made the transition. The short answer is I got to be very good at dealing with dogma. But, actually, I got an inkling of what I would be dealing with as education editor when I was still covering religion.

I walked in one day to find a telegram on my desk that started out, "For the first time since Moses . . ." Those of you who read *The New York Times* know that we feature ourselves as something of the paper of record; we write for posterity, not for the reader the next morning. So I thought that if I could start out my story with "For the first time since Moses . . .," I would be at the top of the front page for sure. I read on and it said, "For the first time since Moses the rabbi is going to bring the Ten Commandments down from Mt. Sinai. Come to the Overseas Press Club at ten o'clock and find out all about it."

I wasn't sure whether this was all hype or only partly hype, so I dialed the number at the end of the telegram and got a secretary at a temple in the New York suburbs. I asked for the rabbi, and the secretary said he had gone on to the news conference. I said, "Can you tell me a little about this telegram?" And she said, "Well, our temple is Temple Sinai. Moses got the Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai, and we thought it would be nice to go over and get them and bring them back to have them on either side of the arch in the sanctuary."

Rather surprised, I asked if the rabbi thought that he was going to get the original ones. And she said, "Oh yes, I think so." So at that point I mumbled something about, seems to me that the original ones got broken somewhere along the way. And she said, "Oh, you saw the movie, too!"

That was the first time that I began to suspect that maybe a literacy crisis was brewing in this country.

Anyway, my job is to provide an analysis or overview of the school reform movement from the point of view of a journalist. I am not an editorial writer; I'm a reporter and editor. And I would like to provide a certain analysis and understanding of what is going on from that point of view. I would like to describe how I see the whole school reform movement.

Historical Patterns

As you look at school reform in this country, there are a couple of patterns historically. The first is, school reform in this country tends to be periodic and episodic. We tend to focus on it briefly, do things, then move on to other things. Obviously, the concern about education that occurred right after the launching of Sputnik in 1957 was an example of this. It means that we tend to be fickle. But on the other hand, we seem to have a capacity as a country to seize a moment, to focus our resources, do something, and then move on.

The GI Bill, similarly, had enormous effects on higher education, democratizing and broadening access. It is difficult to overstate the consequences of the GI Bill. Nobody had this in mind when it was enacted. As a matter of fact—and this is going to sound ridiculous—colleges lobbied against the GI Bill at the time. They were afraid it was going to bring in older students, some of whom would be married and have kids, all these things that colleges weren't used to dealing with. The GI Bill was enacted as a way of reintegrating veterans into society after the war. It went on to have big effects on education of course.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of the 1960's was an anti-poverty measure. Lyndon Johnson, who graduated from a teachers college, never had his name on an education bill during his entire political career. And of course, Sputnik. There, education was a vehicle for efforts that went into the science curriculum and so forth. It was a way of responding to an external military threat. It was not aimed at education per se.

The Current Wave of Reform

I think you will see that these two patterns also apply to the current wave of school reform. It has been periodic and intense. It may go on longer than the reform that occurred in response to Sputnik; we seem to be very, very serious about it. But, nevertheless, it has been twenty-five years since we've had this kind of interest in education. The other thing is that it is a response to a perceived outside threat. In this case, the threat is not military as it was in the Sputnik period, but economic.

Back in the post-Sputnik era I remember you could go out into your back yard and look up at night and see that little speck moving across the sky. Someone suggested to me that what we should do in order to mobilize the country was to get the Japanese to shoot a Toyota into orbit, and then we could have a nice visual symbol of the problem we have. But once again we have that pattern of education becoming a vehicle through which we respond to an outside threat to our society.

There are a couple of ways in which the current reform is unique. One is, I can't think of another time when we have addressed education across the board—the entire curriculum and at all levels. The post-Sputnik concern about educational reform focused on math and science and, to a lesser extent, on foreign languages. It focused on the high school. It certainly was not comprehensive. The other acts applied either to certain groups of students or certain ages or whatever. Here, we have an across-the-board concern about quality across the curriculum. It is focused on the elementary and secondary. It is now bouncing up to the college. You are beginning to hear talk about the quality of the college curricula. It is moving downward, a lot of emphasis now on early childhood, programs for three- and four-year-olds, etc. But it really is the first comprehensive look at the quality of education overall, and education at the core of it—what gets taught.

An Alliance of Political and Corporate Leadership

Secondly, it is different because it is not federal. It is a state effort. More than that, it is essentially an alliance of the political leadership and the corporate leadership. This is important, as it says something about the limitations of reform, as well. The corporate interest in educational reform is obvious. It's a question of assuring manpower, both high level skills and entry level skills—again, going back to that comprehensiveness.

It is perhaps more complicated for the political leadership. We are talking essentially about governors in states and educational committees in the state legislatures. First, it is a response to pressure from parents. If you had to look for a key event on this score, I think it would be when Time magazine picked the computer as the Man-of-the-Year four or five years ago. This had a noticeable effect, because it symbolized that we are entering a technological society. The message was clear to everybody. Principals of schools started being asked by boards of education if they were spending enough money on computers. There was a big psychological shift. Parents understand the importance of education and are scared to death that their kids are not going to be geared up for a technological society that everybody knows is emerging. So the political pressure from parents on political leaders has been a major factor.

The other thing is simply the recognition that the economic prosperity of states requires this. It is necessary in order to get skilled workers to fuel the economy. It is necessary to attract executives who are going to run the industries. I think, by and large, the political leadership and the corporate leadership understand these things.

Involving Educators in Reform

A couple of elements are still missing from school reform. One missing element is the educators. By and large, reform efforts have bypassed teachers and educational policy makers. Maybe this was necessary in order to get the job done, but there are also some limitations to the political process.

The political process can do two things well: it can effect the input by providing resources, a psychological mandate, money, and so forth; and it can mandate outcomes. It can say that if you are going to get a high school diploma in the state of West Virginia or in New York, you must have so many credits. You have to fulfill these standards. It can provide input, and define the output, the objective, or the outcome.

It isn't very good, however, at getting from the input to the output. Eventually, the door closes behind a teacher and students in a room, and the corporate leader isn't there; the governor isn't there; the legislators aren't there, just the teacher and the student. So, if you're going to get from that input to the output you want, then you must join the educators themselves.

For the most part, this has not been done. That is the process we are observing now. Reform packages have been enacted. Some are late, some are coming back at it, but, basically, the political process has finished its work. Now it's a question of getting the educators on board. That is what the Carnegie Reforms are doing, and that seems to me to be where we are now.

At-Risk Students

Another missing element is what is coming to be known as the at-risk or high-risk children. It is one thing to raise standards and expectations. It is good, necessary, and a fine thing. Undoubtedly, lots of children who were performing at a low level, are going to respond to new challenges and new standards and perform at a higher level. But there is also going to be a group who aren't going to do that for a whole variety of reasons, which is a whole other topic. They simply are not going to be able to meet the standards, and the question is, what do you do about these young people?

This is nothing new. We have always had students who have not performed at a high level. Actually, we used to have a lot more, and we sloughed them off. Until very recently we did not take handicapped children very seriously. Certainly in the halcyon days of the 30's, nobody paid any attention to large groups of students at all. Now, because of the social changes of the 50's, 60's, and early 70's, we do. We still accepted not educating a substantial group of students, and the economy always did fairly well without them.

Things have changed. We've raised standards so that those who aren't meeting them are suddenly more visible. We simply cannot create a two-tiered society. We cannot afford it socially, and I don't think we can afford it economically. So, we have to find some way of addressing this question of high-risk students, who are suddenly more visible.

Reform at the College Level

As we ponder this question about the relationship of education and the economy, it is helpful — even though we are essentially talking about elementary/secondary — to think about the college level. Harvard is having its 350th birthday, and, since Harvard was our first college, we're also observing the 350th anniversary of higher education in this country. I have been looking back over the history of higher education in relation to what we've been talking about.

For the first 250 years, colleges and universities in this country were simply preservers and conservers of knowledge and teaching. We tended to be denominationally oriented, with a tradition and an interesting kind of academic freedom. A professor was free to adopt a particular academic tradition, whether Anglican, Calvinist, Methodist, or whatever, and to work within that tradition. But he was essentially preserving ideas, gathered over time, and passing them on to the next generation.

Only in the 1860's and 1870's, did we import the concept of the German research university into this country. When Johns Hopkins was founded in 1876, universities went into the business, not of preserving and conserving, but of creating knowledge.

Only in the last century have we had a concept that the university, or the educational system as a whole, creates new knowledge. Universities, in effect, got a second product. In addition to teaching, they developed the creation of knowledge as a second purpose. This knowledge always had economic value, except, before, it tended to be indirect.

Land grant colleges researched agriculture. Someone else then took this knowledge and turned it into a new piece of machinery or a new manufacturing process. There was an indirect relationship between this new knowledge and its economic applicability.

Now, we live in a knowledge society, an information society. It means that there is no distance at all between the creation of knowledge and the economic value of that knowledge. As a matter of fact, the economic value of knowledge sometimes precedes its creation. Genetic engineering companies have been formed on the prospect that new knowledge will be created, and people have become millionaires over something that doesn't even exist yet. Companies move close to a university to be there when and if a professor has an idea which becomes new knowledge with economic applicability. So, this product, knowledge, is instantly translated into economic value. This means, simply, that the connection between the university and the economy is closer than it has ever been before, and inseparable.

Another way of looking at this is that we have now moved from a reliance on natural resources to a reliance on mental resources. Japan is an island about the size of California, two-thirds of which is uninhabitable, with no natural resources whatsoever. Since the Meiji restoration in the 1870s, Japan has certainly understood that it had to live by its wits. This is the reason that education is so critical in Japan. Everybody understands this because it's the only thing that they've got going for them. There are no natural resources.

But the same thing is happening here. I don't have to labor this point in a state so aware of the importance of coal and other natural resources, but look at the way the economic map of prosperity in this country is being redrawn. Only five years ago, people were writing off New England as a place time had passed by, as too static, too locked into traditional industries. The South, Texas, the oil areas, the energy areas were booming. What has happened in the last few years? Intellectual resources have suddenly created a whole new kind of prosperity. Massachusetts has prospered and is booming for two reasons, Harvard and MIT. It is basically that simple.

The immediate economic value of this new product of the university — knowledge — is one thing. But also the message is pretty clear. Our institutions are absolutely interdependent on each other. It is not just that education is "too important to be left to the educators." Within the triangle of the university, the elementary/secondary schools, and the corporation, every possible kind of interaction goes on. Universities look to industry for research funds and places to market their products; industries are heavily dependent on universities for research. Universities are reaching down into elementary and secondary schools, and not simply out of altruism. They're doing it because they have a self-interest in preserving the flow of able students. Their choice is this: either help high schools raise their standards, or lower college standards because there will not be enough people capable of doing what we now consider to be university work. Companies are adopting schools, and moving into the elementary/secondary level. Simply, there is a complicated back and forth traffic between the points of that triangle, and everybody in the three sectors understands intuitively that we need each other. Things are too complicated to rely on any single institution to do any particular job. We must cooperate.

Restructuring the Elementary/Secondary System

We also have to ask, whether we are not headed for some kind of substantial restructuring of the elementary/secondary system. I have no idea how this is going to work out. In the last century, since the school system was created — and schools really only go back about a century — there have been no major changes in structure or organization from an organization meant to serve an essentially agrarian economy. Maybe we have to look for some kinds of fundamental structures.

I am so interested in the Carnegie Forum report because, it is the first *national* effort suggesting a way of creating new structures — the idea of the lead teacher, or the idea of setting up a national certification system for teachers. It is interesting because it raises the possibility of looking for fundamental new structures. And while we work to preserve and improve the current ones, I think we also have to keep that in mind.

I have no idea what direction this is going; I think very few people have that kind of foresight. Certainly, as a journalist, I am going to watch it closely. The position I find myself in reminds me of a story about a country preacher in a small church in New Hampshire. They had just redecorated the inside of the sanctuary, and he was meeting with the Board of Deacons who had supervised the redecoration. The preacher said, "You've done a fine job, but there's just one thing that would make it absolutely perfect, and that's a chandelier. What do you think our chances are of getting a chandelier?" The head of the Board of Deacons was a laconic, New Hampshire farmer type, who just sat with his arms crossed, shaking his head and not saying a word. The preacher pushed the matter. "Well, why not? Why can't we get a chandelier?" And the farmer said, "Well, there's three reasons. First of all, nobody here can spell it. Second, even if we had a chandelier, nobody here could play it. And third, what we really should be spending our money on is better light."

Thank you.

Relationship of the Public Schools to Business

Robert Schwartz
Executive Director
The Boston Compact

Introduction

Before I talk specifically about the Boston Compact, I want to say a few words about business resources in the schools under the general topic of what the business community can do to help improve public schools. There are essentially five categories of help, five kinds of resources that businesses have to offer.

Financial Support

First, obviously, there is financial support. Well-targeted business dollars — as risk money, R&D money, venture capital for the schools — can have a positive impact, particularly through vehicles such as the state-wide education fund. There are also many examples of local education funds around the country. But even in Boston where we have a large-scale, privately funded endowment to support the schools and three-and-a-half million dollars of corporate endowment, the annual income from that endowment is still about one percent of the total amount of public dollars supporting the schools. Private dollars, while important, are still only going to be very marginal. As an educator, I would encourage corporations to continue to find creative ways of targeting dollars to support school improvement, but clearly financial resources from the private sector can only have a relatively modest effect.

Business and School Partnerships

The second kind of resource is probably the most common resource that businesses offer to schools around the country, that is, the school partnership model, where an individual company works together with one or more schools in a local setting. Through these arrangements, businesses offer financial help to a school, but, more typically, they offer a range of different kinds of assistance, from sending company employees to talk with students and teachers about the local labor market or about the kinds of skills needed to compete in the work force, to providing internships, career counseling, even help with curriculum, especially on the vocational side. Partnership programs are most important because they provide a way for business and school people to get to know one another. They are less important for the specific content of the partnerships, more for the forum for communication and trust-building they provide.

Technical Assistance for Management

A third kind of resource is technical assistance, particularly focused on the management of public education. This includes management programs for principals, superintendents, and for central office leadership. Although we have a few examples around the country of business help in designing and carrying out management training, it is a resource that has not been exploited enough. Granted, there are major differences between managing in the public sector and in the private sector. Public sector environments tend to be extremely turbulent. Yet some generic skills, particularly from the corporate side, can be incorporated in training and retraining programs for school leaders.

Access to Jobs

The fourth resource—very important in Boston, given our economy—is access to jobs. We focused, not simply on well structured programs to help students make the transition from school to work, but on how to provide incentives for young people, particularly those from socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds, to come to school every day and to take school seriously. All too often, a young adult perceives little connection between staying in school and doing well and what happens in the post-high school environment.

Political Support

In Boston, we saw the job resource as important, chiefly, from the school point of view, because of its connection to the fifth resource, which is political support. The single most important thing that the business community can provide for public schools today is political support.

Political support can be used as leverage. Business leaders can throw their weight behind specific issues or get educators to commit to a set of reforms in exchange for political backing.

In Boston, only about 10 percent of our households have children in the public schools. By and large, the politically weakest 10 percent of the electorate has the largest stake in the quality of the public schools. We have a substantial parochial school system, existing side-by-side with the public schools, which, in part, accounts for that low number. But all across the country public school parents are a declining percentage of the electorate.

For educators, then, building new constituencies to support the schools is an extremely important need or motivation, one that the business community can exploit, if you will. The nature of the strategy developed by the California Roundtable was, in effect, to say: we are willing to come into the political arena and lobby hard for more resources to support education in this state, but only if those resources are accompanied by a set of internal reforms or improvements.

After commissioning a series of studies, pulling together what is known about school improvement, educational and political leaders negotiated in a pretty hard-nosed fashion to agree on the outlines of those reforms. Then, after reaching an agreement, they marched forward together — educational leadership, political leadership, business leadership — to get the resources necessary to put the reforms into place.

The Boston Compact

At the local level, that's essentially what the Boston Compact has been — a set of locally negotiated agreements between corporate and school leadership, with the participation of local government and the Mayor, as well. On the business side the offer was this: we will put on the table an organized way to provide the resources you want. In our case, we focused on better access to jobs for the graduates of the city schools, because we saw it as crucially important to create an incentive for students to stay in school. In return, the school system promised the business community better performance in the schools. In a six-month series of discussions and negotiations between top level business leaders — chief executive officers with major companies in the city—and the Superintendent of Schools, a written agreement was developed with measurable goals: job goals on the business side, school improvement goals on the school side. That agreement went into effect in the fall of 1982.

Our goal, when we began four years ago, was essentially to place any young person, graduating from one of Boston's seventeen public high schools and meeting increased graduation standards put into place by the school system during that four year period, in a job, in a training program, or in a post-secondary institution.

Our agreement with the business community focused on a jobs program. We graduate about 3,000 young persons a year in the City. Given our college enrollment rates, we estimated that a jobs program, generating roughly 1,000 job slots a year and holding them in reserve for graduates, would be large enough to provide a placement opportunity for every young person, who wanted to go to work and was qualified.

We looked at the greater Boston labor market, and asked, how many entry level jobs are filled each year by 18 to 24 year olds? We estimated about 30,000. Could we, then, develop a strategy for working with our employers so that roughly one-thirtieth of the entry level jobs in this local labor market — we did not believe that was an unrealistic percentage — could be set aside so that graduates from the Boston high schools would have first crack at those jobs?

Four years ago we began with a target of 400 jobs. That was met. The second year it was raised to 600. That was met. The third year it was raised to 800. That was met. This year, we believe we'll be at the 1,000 mark.

For the graduating class of 1985, for all of Boston's high schools, we did a six-month follow-up study and found that unemployment for that class was less than five percent. This is in a city where the school population is 70 percent minority students — historically, substantially under-represented in the local labor market — and where minority youth unemployment rates, despite the overall health of the Massachusetts' economy, are typically in the 25-30 percent range. Through a city-wide agreement — over 550 participating firms signed employer pledges to work with the schools — and by trading school improvement for better access to the labor market, we developed a strategy to enlist the business community in efforts to improve the schools.

The chief motivation on the corporate side, it's fair to say, is economic self-interest. In Massachusetts in 1993, we will have 43 percent fewer 19 year olds than we had in 1983. If you're running a business or if you're a college admissions officer, given the dominance of the higher education community in Boston, your basic question is, where are we going to get the people to fill seats in our colleges or to fill entry level jobs? Human resources are scarce in Massachusetts, and there is a growing perception that we cannot afford to waste anybody at this point, that every young person needs to be equipped to go on to higher education or to employment.

On the school side, goals were to improve attendance in the high schools, improve basic skills performance as measured by standardized tests, improve preparation for employment, and reduce the dropout rate. In each of the first three areas there has been measurable progress for each of the last three years. There has been virtually no progress in the dropout rate, however, which in some ways is the most important goal. We are looking at a city-wide dropout rate that, I suspect, seems extraordinarily high. 43 percent of our students that begin the ninth grade do not make it through the other end of the tunnel. Dropout rates, I suspect, in some communities in this state may be similarly high.

Can a well structured jobs program, by itself, really make a dent in that rate? Our experience to date says, no. The kinds of changes that have been talked about for the last two days, the kind of fundamental changes that the Carnegie Panel Report and other reports are suggesting, in my view, really need to be put in place if we are seriously going to make a dent in the dropout rate. The promise of a job typically becomes an important motivating factor for a young person in the last year or two of high school. If the prior experience of a young person has been one of frustration and failure in the early and middle years of schooling, the likelihood of appealing on the basis of some future expectation is pretty small.

Lessons from Experience in Boston

Through our experience, we have learned the importance of providing both financial and other incentives to reward effective performance, to reward high quality written plans. We required written school plans of each school, made discretionary dollars available to support these plans, and then held people accountable for results.

Again, one theme has been not only how to achieve some measure of deregulation, but how to inject competition at the local level, so that principals who demonstrate strong leadership and can build a coalition locally to move their school ahead, are given resources and support and held accountable for results. Their spending is not monitored every step of the way, in terms of this or that regulation.

Conclusion

A steady rhythm of exciting ideas—and the Carnegie report almost teases us with a vision of how schools might be—alternates with the reality of what can be done, given the current conditions in the schools, and given the difficulty of making changes in institutions that tend to the status quo. How do we do that?

Also, we all must face the importance of investing more in staff development and technical assistance to schools if we are to expect them to improve performance. Thank you.

Symposium II: Discussion

Question: We have talked a great deal about high-risk children. With the kind of results we are talking about in Japan, what do they do about those high-risk children?

Doyle: The Japanese have an old-fashioned system. They expect children to master the curriculum and master the material presented to them. The children are expected to work hard, and work even harder if they don't do well. The Japanese system is one we should look at carefully, not try to copy. It causes many problems as well as many opportunities. But it is a system very well suited to produce the work force for mature production technology. That's behind us now. We have to think about schools that will produce the work force for the knowledge-based society ahead of us.

Fiske: Another point to understand about the Japanese school system is that it suits their society very well. How much we can take from the Japanese is limited, because the Japanese school system has a very different purpose than ours, at least with the sector of the economy that has the big corporations and life-long employment. If you are going to keep a worker for forty years, you are willing to take two or three years and not get any real work out of that person while you train them. So, the corporations do a lot of training. You never see a computer in a Japanese high school. Schools, for instance, do not have computer literacy courses. When you need computer skills, which obviously you do in a lot of Japanese industries, the corporation teaches you.

We look to the schools to provide somebody ready to go to work. Japanese industry does not look to schools for workers, but for schools to screen out people who will not fit into the values and the culture of the particular corporation. If you get through the exam system and into Todai, the University of Tokyo, or one of the other institutions, any employer can be assured that you are bright, that you will work hard, that you can assimilate large amounts of information, and most of all, that you will not challenge the culture into which you are put. It is a screening system, more than a training system. It is a very efficient screening system, and it works well because the company teaches you what you need to know.

There are fundamental differences between us, not just the heterogeneity of our society and the homogeneity of theirs. They lend themselves to a highly structured, centralized system that would never work here. They agree on what education is, which we don't. Education in Japan is the transmission of facts, not training to think. They have a tremendous creativity problem. Japanese mothers are always fascinated by American schools. I remember talking to a group of wives of Japanese businessmen and diplomats, living in Scarsdale, who had their daughters in the American system. Sons are sent back to Japan for high school, because they have to go through the system. Girls are not going to be employed, so they are free to leave them here. The Japanese mother loves when a teacher says that her daughter has tremendous musical ability, or we're going to develop that talent. No teacher in Japan ever told those mothers that. Japanese education imposes something from the outside, instead of developing what is inside. When given a choice, that is to say with their daughters, they prefer our system, for all its deficiencies.

It is easy to over-glamourize the Japanese system. It is a very efficient system for a very distinct culture, and it has a very different purpose than education in this country.

Schwartz: In my discussions with employers, I've been struck by how often they say, we want our high schools to establish: first, literacy; and second, employability, i.e., a cluster of attitudes about what it means to hold a job, to come to work every day on time, to work in a cooperative setting, to be able to take supervision. When it comes to specific skills training, our employers — mostly medium and large size employers — are saying, leave the specific training to us. In part, this is because the perceived literacy training, if you will, in the schools has been so weak that the clear first priority is imparting the ability to read and write. But it also suggests that our schools, given the pace of technological change, are inevitably going to be behind the state of the art in using machinery — whether high tech, medium tech, low tech, or no tech. At least for Massachusetts, this has been an important lesson.

Question: Boston essentially has a dual system, a parochial system and a public school system. You mentioned that 10 percent of households use the public schools. In a sense, this has been going on for years, and is probably a good example of how deregulation works in practice. **Would you comment on how this competition might affect, not only students, who may have a choice between parochial and public schools, but also teachers, what pressures they put on each other, and how that is helping?**

Schwartz: First, I should clarify that when I say 10 percent of Boston families use the public schools, that doesn't mean that the other 90 percent are in the parochial or private system. In fact, if we look at elementary age children, it is probably pretty close to 50-50 at this point, public and parochial. There is a long tradition. The move to parochial schools was exacerbated by our city-wide school desegregation orders in the 1970's, but that has not been a dramatic change. More significantly, we are seeing the continuing departure of families with school-age children to the suburbs, and, because Boston has gone through an extraordinary economic revival, lots of young families with preschool children or no children moving into the city. We have a large elderly population, and a hundred thousand college students. That skews our statistics.

In one sense, at least, teachers don't see public and parochial systems as directly competitive. The weight scales in parochial schools are so far inferior, that few people with the option of teaching in a public school would go into a parochial school. There are other satisfactions, however, from parochial schools or independent schools — non-economic incentives — that make a difference.

In our setting, however, public schools are the schools of last resort. They serve predominantly low-income populations — low-income whites, as well as low-income blacks and Hispanics. We were able to rally strong business support and investment to improve those schools because we realize that the long-range economy is going to need these people, and also because of concern about the social consequences of having a thriving downtown economy and poor city neighborhoods with stockpiles of young people lacking the skills to participate in that economy.

Doyle: Academic research, relating to this question, is really quite fascinating. First, James Coleman and his colleagues found that inner-city Catholic schools did a significantly better job educating minority, disadvantaged youngsters, than comparable public schools. This was a source of indignation among the public school establishment, so much so that they simply dismissed it and didn't think to ask the second question: If this is true, why?

Chubb and Moe, organizational theorists at the Brookings Institute, have asked that question, and they are getting powerful answers. Their research indicates that Coleman was right, and the reason is that these schools are deregulated. They are independent, freestanding institutions. They are successful, not because they have superior virtue. Quite to the contrary. If Catholic schools had as much money to spend as public schools, they would probably over-administer, too. But, if you're a Catholic school principal, the only question you take to the Bishop is a theological one. You don't take pedagogical and organizational/managerial questions to him. The school really is autonomous and independent in important ways. Coleman also discovered that public schools, which are organized and run like private schools, that is, with autonomy and independence, also do well with low-income, minority youngsters. So, I think we've got hard research evidence here, that deregulation of schools does make a difference.

Surprisingly, religion is not an important variable today, not as important as it used to be. The percentage of black Catholics is very small — only 7 percent of American blacks are Catholic. But we are witnessing large numbers of protestant Fundamentalists, who would not normally embrace anything Catholic, entering parochial schools, because it is an affordable, academically sound, and physically safe alternative. It is a real test for the public schools. If they don't confront it squarely, we'll be back in a situation similar to the 1830's, when Dewitt Clinton created the Free School Society. Public schools were then schools for paupers, and in many of our cities today, public schools look like schools for paupers.

Question: Circumstances in West Virginia are different from the circumstances in Boston. Our economy is not growing. There are not enough jobs to go around; it is a dual problem. In addition, much of this state is rural, with widely dispersed populations over broad areas, so that a model like the Boston Compact is a little difficult for us to translate into action. **Are there ways that what you have been doing in Boston could be amended to fit our circumstances, or have other models been developed elsewhere in the country that would apply to West Virginia?**

Schwartz: Your observation about the difficulty of transplanting the Boston experience to this setting is absolutely on target. You do have a chicken and egg problem here. That is, do you focus primarily on economic development strategies, on strategies to induce new businesses to come here or to diversify? Do you deal with the demand side of the equation or focus first on the supply side of the equation? Obviously, you have to do both at once.

I do not envy you the task of figuring out how to persuade young people to stay in school, given the economic realities confronting many parts of the state. And yet, that's the real challenge. Ultimately, having a high quality labor force is going to be absolutely critical to whatever industrial strategy you develop. If organizing the entry level labor market to provide easier access is not a viable alternative, or only for limited parts of the state, then the next question is: if access to jobs is not the right lever that the business community can use to help induce school improvement and school change, what is? You really don't have any alternative in terms of the goal itself.

There is a clear consensus that you have to find a way, over the long haul, to improve performance in your schools. And there is a general recognition that political and private sector leaders have a key role to play in making that happen. So the next question is: what other resources might you put on the table? The rural issue is one, frankly, that I don't have enough experience with to be able to usefully comment on. Virtually all of my experience has been urban.

Doyle: A short comment on the resources question, and it is an idea so radical most of you won't take it seriously. One of the great reforms of the mid-20th century was the uniform salary schedule, where all teachers — Kindergarten through high school teachers — were put on the same salary schedule across the school district, or across the state as a whole. It was viewed as a great reform. It, in turn, has turned out to be not so great a reform, because it creates a terrible conundrum.

Teaching is at once the most overly and underpaid of our professions by virtue of paying the worst what you pay the best, and the best what you pay the worst. We have got to be able to rationalize teacher compensation in some way, so that we pay people on the basis of what they produce. The first rule, of course, is to pay people more who work more. Unions will agree to that, so that is not a problem. You can pay more for extra duties. With year-round schools, you can pay teachers for the extra quarter, or, if you have coaching or nonclassroom duties, then pay more.

But more important would be to put teaching into a market in the same way as college teaching. Professors of medicine are paid more than professors of English literature, professors of law are paid more than engineering professors, and engineering professors more than professors of history. The logic, at the elementary and secondary level, would be to see what the market tells you about pay differentials as they would emerge between elementary and secondary, and within disciplines. Would professors or teachers of advanced-placement physics command higher salaries than teachers of English.

Teachers groups will recoil at the suggestion, at least initially. Al Shanker, with the American Federation of Teachers, now seems prepared to talk about it seriously, and I think openly. This means you can think seriously about paying some teachers what they deserve, as it were, in terms of the value they add to the task they are engaged in. The Carnegie Commission report, which is very impressive in most ways, is simply unrealistic in its proposals about across-the-board teacher increases. I don't think the nation as a whole is prepared to pay 20 or 30 billion dollars extra a year to increase teacher salaries. That is what a 20 or 25 percent increase would cost. Texas couldn't do it during the boom; Mark White couldn't get it passed; I can't imagine West Virginia doing it; I cannot imagine any state doing it. But I can imagine states paying some teachers significantly more. That is a very difficult hurdle to get over both intellectually and politically, but I think it is worth exploring.

Question: Mr. Schwartz elaborated on a suggestion made earlier in the day, that the Legislature is a child of the people. You have to build the right political climate in order to accomplish these goals. We can use all the high-sounding phrases, and have all the high-sounding aims in the world, but if we do not have the support of our electorate, we cannot accomplish anything. Along with paying more, the electorate demands internal reform. They want to know that money is used wisely. We are going to have to make sure, as we go along, that we avoid the stumbling block of insisting people pay more, while not addressing the hard problems.

I was impressed that you did give some ideas about innovating financing. Fundamentally, we must rely on general revenue and property taxes, but there are a lot of ways that we can add to the quality of our education program by innovative financing, and you mentioned one — endowment. Nobody in West Virginia thinks in terms of endowment for public education. They do for higher education, but **what is wrong with thinking of endowment for public education? What's the matter with an Adopt-a-School program, or having a local industry be concerned with the problems, and doing some of the financing? What would be wrong with an endowed position, much like an endowed chair, where you see a need, for example, in a county where there is a high dropout rate? What's the matter with an endowed position to address that problem? And I won-**

dered, do you have any other suggestions on innovative ways that we can help education?

Smith: You might consider a legislative strategy if the county is the right unit here. The goal ought to be to develop a process that requires key people from various sectors at the county level to come together around a plan based on the needs and priorities of the students in that particular county. That is, rather than looking to the school people alone to define priorities, put money on the table to encourage a coalition of local leaders, government, business, and school leaders to develop a plan for schools in the county or that region. Put emphasis on dropouts, at-risk students, and the transitional problems of what happens to students after they leave high school. Require each participating institution — business, higher education, government, schools — to identify what resources they are going to bring to the table, how they plan to use existing resources, and what role they intend to play in this county-wide plan. Then, allow individual schools within that jurisdiction to compete for new funds to translate county goals into school-specific programs. Since you already have in place a state-wide mechanism for private funding, the West Virginia Education Fund, there might conceivably be a strategy for using high risk private dollars, matched with new state dollars, to support school-based innovations to carry out county-wide plans.

The critical thing is to get the right set of players at the table, not simply state-wide, but regionally, to help figure out what resources are there, what our needs are, and how to pool them.

Fiske: A number of school districts in New York City have had success with mini-grant programs, in which funds —either out of an endowment or out of operating budgets, whatever — are made available to teachers on a competitive basis. These do not have to be large amounts of money, a couple hundred dollars will do an awful lot. When you talk about a local school district in New York City, you're talking about 32 districts, each with 30,000 students. District One, for example, on the Lower East Side, has been very successful freeing up small amounts of money as an incentive. Teachers come up with ideas and compete for it, and they really come up with some sensational things.

Question: **With regard to deregulation of schools, a voucher system is talked about frequently. Is a voucher system in place anywhere in this country, and is there any history at all?**

Fiske: As far as I know, it has never been tried. The program cited in California was not a real voucher system. New Hampshire talked about it, but never got it off the ground. Are you aware of any?

Doyle: No, none has been tried in a demonstration sense. Vermont, for many years, has had tuitioned children. A third of Vermont's school committees do not own and operate school buildings, so they pay tuition if their children go to other school districts or to private schools. So-called public academies in New England, which are privately owned, attract many children through tuition reimbursement schemes, but these are pragmatic responses to particular problems in New England.

The closest thing to a true voucher system would be the GI Bill or the existing Pell Grant program in higher education. Denmark, Australia, and Holland are probably the three premier examples of functioning voucher systems at the elementary and secondary levels in other developed democracies, and they are well developed and extensive. In Holland, for example, 70 percent of Dutch youngsters attend a private school at government expense through voucher arrangements. In Australia, 30-32 percent attend private school at government expense. In Denmark, it is a tiny fraction, only 4-5 percent.

The reasons for doing this in these countries are quite instructive. When public education became a reality in each country, they included religious instruction in the curriculum for the dominant religion in each country, as a device to guarantee and ensure religious liberty. Voucher systems were created to permit children to attend schools that were consistent with their own denominational beliefs. In Denmark, any group of parents, who among them have more than 28 children of school age, are guaranteed by statutes the right to start their own school at full government expense for any religious, political, or ideological reasons. And it may be because they are so free to do so that they don't do it on a very large scale. Only about 6-8 percent of Danish children attend such schools. But it's a part of their statutory, constitutional tradition.

Comment: Even though a pure voucher idea has not really been tested in this country, a lot of cities, within the public school context, have focused on what are called public schools of choice. One reason we see comparisons between parochial schools and public schools is the element of choice. And it seems that a way to maximize choice within the public context for parents and students is to accentuate the differences between schools, particularly at the secondary level, and to give people the option to choose specific programs and even specific schools. It is also important to promote the sense of professional autonomy for teachers, that the Carnegie panel tried to emphasize.

Smith: It is important that we share information on the West Virginia Fund, which illustrates that private financing and private support in the public sector, as well as minigrant potential, are already underway and thriving in West Virginia. David Lowe is President of the West Virginia Education Fund, and we will ask him to discuss their progress in these areas.

Lowe: The West Virginia Education Fund was a vision of a half a dozen business leaders three years ago. Most of those people are here — Gaston Caperton, Buck Harlass, Lacey Rice, Don Holland, Governor Smith, Paul Jenkins, and the Benedum Foundation trustees. These men are responsible for the West Virginia Education Fund's existence.

Its success can be attributed to two things: one, what it is doing is right, necessary, and good; two, it has an executive director who is an absolute spark plug, and those of you who know Vivian Kidd know what I mean. This is the first state-wide Education Fund in the country, and it is being emulated in other states. Vivian has been asked to visit other states and to tell them how we are doing it and how it came to be. So, West Virginians have some good things to feel very positive about.

The Mini-Grant program has contributed over $125,000 to over 450 teachers in its three years. When school starts this year, more than 100 businesses will be linked with 100 schools throughout the state in the Partnerships Program. If education reform is episodic, as Mr. Fiske suggests, then partnerships are at the epidemic stage. We have hired a full-time program director at the Education Fund, simply to manage the Partnerships Program. The Outstanding Teacher Program will consist of a $5000, tax-free cash award to a teacher in grades K-6, a teacher in grade 7-12, and a principal. The process will begin this fall, and the first set of awards will be given in the Spring of 1987.

The Education Fund works in cooperation with the West Virginia Roundtable and the State Department of Education, with support of the Benedum Foundation. We will be conducting a two-day seminar on Wednesday, the 29th of October, in Charleston.

The topic will focus on collaborative efforts between business and education. We will be talking about partnerships, how to make them work, what gets them into trouble, and we will be going beyond partnerships. We have invited legislators, other government leaders, business leaders, and leading educators throughout the state, county level educators, and county board people. We think the enthusiasm which is coming through these programs can be heightened by this conference.

VII. Closing Remarks and Conclusions

The *West Virginia Roundtable Symposium on Economic Development Through Education* concluded with remarks by Hulett C. Smith, Chairman of the Roundtable Task Force on Education, and Thomas C. Burns, Chairman of the West Virginia Roundtable. Each reiterated the call to action which had characterized the Symposium, and praised the commitment evidenced by participants to seek new avenues for reform. They expressed appreciation to the participants for their ideas, and acknowledged the speakers for contributing innovative and creative approaches to educational reform.

Governor Smith noted that the event had set a precedent by assembling the most influential people in the state for the express purpose of investigating the relationship between economic development and the reform of education. He stressed the need for ongoing activity and charged the group with maintaining, throughout the coming months, the level of energy generated by the gathering.

Symposium proceedings were disseminated to Roundtable members for further discussion and the formulation of recommendations for future action. Widespread interest throughout the state has encouraged the Education Task Force to publish the proceedings with those recommendations. The resulting document is herewith offered to the people of West Virginia — it's Governor, legislators, business leaders, educators, parents and students—as inspiration and as a practical guide to improve the quality of their public schools and thereby assure the state's economic revitalization.

Appendix A
Participant List

The Economic Development of West Virginia Through Education Symposium

August 6-7, 1986

Participant List

Mr. Richard Adams, President, United National Bank
Mr. George Andrick, Director of Economic Development, WSAZ-TV
Honorable Bob Ashley, Member, House of Delegates, Tenth District
Honorable Gilbert E. Bailey, Member, House Education Committee, Twentieth District
Mr. Robert F. Baronner, President, The Kanawha Valley Bank, N.A.
Mr. Henry A. Bergstrom, President, Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation
Honorable John Si Boettner, Member, Senate Education Committee, Eighth District
Honable Donna J. Boley, Member, Senate Education Committee, Third District
Dr. Lewis Branscomb, Vice President & Chief Scientist, International Business Machines Corporation
Mr. William T. Bright, President, Bright of America — Land Use Corp.
Honorable Bonnie L. Brown, Member, House Judiciary Committee, Twenty-Third District
Honorable Marjorie H. Burke, Member, House Finance Committee, Ninth District
Honorable Robert W. Burk, Jr., Member, House Finance Committee, Ninth District
Mr. Thomas C. Burns, Vice President, C&P Telephone Company
Mr. Owen B. Butler, Chairman of the Board (Ret.), The Proctor & Gamble Company
Mr. W. Gaston Caperton, III, President, McDonough, Caperton, Shepherd Insurance Group

Honorable James M. Casey, Member, House Judiciary Committee, Twelfth District
Honorable H Truman Chafin, Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Sixth District
Honorable John G. Chernenko, Member, Senate Finance Committee, First District
Mr. James Clark, Member, West Virginia Board of Education
Mr. Thomas Cole, Jr., Acting Chancellor, West Virginia Board of Regents
Honorable Stephen L. Cook, Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, Fourteenth District
Mr. Thomas Craig, Member, West Virginia Board of Regents
Honorable Oshel B. Craigo, Member, Senate Finance Committee, Fourth District
Honorable Betty D. Crookshanks, Member, House Judiciary Committee, Twenty-Fifth District
Mr. Jack Deutsch, Reporter, Charleston Daily Mail
Mr. Donald R. Donell, President, Starvaggi Industries, Inc.
Dr. Dennis Doyle, Hudson Institute
Mr. Lysander Dudley, Director, Governor's Office of Economic & Community Development
Mr. William Duncan, President, M.A.C.E.D.
Honorable Larry V. Faircloth, Member, House Finance Committee, Thirty-Eighth District
Honorable John Pat Fanning, Member, Senate Finance Committee, Sixth District
Mr. Edward B. Fiske, Education Editor, The New York Times
Mr. D. Max Francis, President, United Hospital Center
Honorable Lucian Fry, Member, House Finance Committee, Fourteenth District
Honorable Linda N. Garrett, Member, House Judiciary Committee, Twenty-Sixth District
Mr. Carl Gilchrist, Branch Manager, IBM Corporation
Honorable Phyllis E. Given, Member, House of Delegates, Thirteenth District
Mr. David Greenfield, Editor, Charleston Daily Mail
Dr. Winfred Godwin, President, Southern Regional Education Board
Mr. Kendall Hall, President, West Virginia Board of Education
Mr. Conrad C. Hammann, President, Halltown Paperboard Company
Mr. James H. Harless, Chairman of the Board, Gilbert Imported Hardwoods
Honorable Barbara Hatfield, Member, House of Delegates, Twenty-Third District
Mr. James W. Heaton, President, Blue Cross & Blue Shield of West Virginia

Ms. Deborah Herndon, Director of Community Relations, Massey Coal Services, Inc.

Mr. C.R. "Bud" Hill, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Merchants and Miners National Bank

Honorable John R. Hoblitzell, Member, House Education Committee, Twenty-Third District

Mr. Don E. Hollen, President, Monongahela Power Company

Honorable Darrell E. Holmes, Member, Senate Finance Committee, Seventeenth District

Honorable Paul Hutchinson, Jr., Member, House Finance Committee, Twenty-Second District

Ms. Carol Innerst, Education Writer, Washington Times

Honorable Mack C. Jarrell, Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, Fifth District

Mr. Paul R. Jenkins, Executive Vice President, Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation

Mr. Frank P. Justice, Vice President, Ashland Oil, Inc.

Honorable Tod J. Kaufman, Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, Seventeenth District

Honorable Bernard V. Kelly, Member, House of Delegates, Second District

Mr. Alan L. Klein, President, Mister Bee Potato Chip Company

Mr. John D. Landers, Vice President — External Affairs, AT&T Communications

Mr. Hank Lawrence, (for John F. McGee), Charleston Newspapers

Ms. Kathy Lawrence, (for Ralph Bean), Hope Gas, Inc.

Honorable Thomas E. Loehr, Member, Senate Finance Committee, Second District

Mr. David Lowe, Division Manager, External Affairs, C&P Telephone Company

Honorable Sondra M. Lucht, Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, Sixteenth District

Honorable William H. Martin, Member, House Education Committee, Fortieth District

Honorable Patricia Mastrantoni, Member, House Judiciary Committee, First District

Honorable R.L. "Bob" McCormick, Member, House Education Committee, Sixteenth District

Mr. Philip V. McGance, Consultant, Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation

Dr. Tom McNeel, Superintendent of Schools, West Virginia Department of Education

Honorable Florence L. Merow, Member, House Education Committee, Thirty-Second District

Honorable Joseph M. Minard, Member, House of Delegates, Thirtieth District

Honorable Arch A. Moore, Jr., Governor, State of West Virginia

Honorable Patrick H. Murphy, Vice Chairman, House Education Committee, Thirty-Seventh District

Honorable Sarah Lee Neal, Member, House Finance Committee, Twenty-Fifth District

Honorable Paul J. Otte, Member, House Education Committee, Third District

Honorable Mario J. Palumbo, Member, Senate Education Committee, Eighth District

Honorable Frederick L. Parker, Member, Senate Education Committee, Tenth District

Mr. John J. Paull, Jr., President, Eagle Manufacturing Company

Mr. Robert Payne, President, BCS, Inc.

Mr. A. Michael Perry, Chairman of the Board, First Huntington National Bank

Mr. Angus E. Peyton, Esquire, Brown and Peyton

Honorable Deborah F. Phillips, Member, House Education Committee, Twelfth District

Mr. William Pitt, III, President, The Greenbrier Hotel

Mr. Richard Powell, Manager, Training & Development Sales, Borg Warner Chemicals, Inc.

Mr. J. Robert Pritchard, President, Pritchard Electric Company, Inc.

Honorable Charlotte J. Pritt, Member, House Finance Committee, Twenty-Third District

Senator Jennings Randolph, Trustee, Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation

Mr. Marshall Reynolds, President, Chapman Printing Company

Mr. Lacy I. Rice, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Mountaineer Bankshares of West Virginia

Honorable Evelyn Richards, Member, House of Delegates, Thirteenth District

Honorable J. Robert Rogers, Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, Seventh District

Honorable Sandy Rogers, Member, House Education Committee, Eighth District

Mr. Orion Y. Row, Vice President, International Operations, URS Dalton

Honorable Lyle F. Sattes, Chairman, House Education Committee, Twenty-Third District

Honorable Larry Schifano, Member, House Judiciary Committee, Thirty-Second District

Dr. Robert Schwartz, Special Assistant to the Governor for Educational Affairs, State of Massachusetts, formerly Executive Director, The Boston Compact

Mr. Nathaniel Semple, Vice President and Director, Business Government Relations, Committee for Economic Development
Honorable William R. Sharpe, Jr., Member, Senate Education Committee, Thirteenth District
Honorable Walton S. Shepherd, III, Member, House Judiciary Committee, Twenty-Third District
Honorable Hulett C. Smith, President, Home Insurance Company, Trustee, Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation
Mr. Richard F. Smith, President, Royal Oldsmobile, Inc.
Honorable Jae Spears, Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, Twelfth District
Ms. Tamara M. Stanton, Legislative Aide, Senator John D. Rockerfeller
Honorable Cody A. Starcher, Member, House Finance Committee, Thirty-First District
Honorable Donald L. Stemple, Member, House Finance Committee, Twenty-Eighth District
Mr. James R. Thomas, II, President, Charleston Renaissance Corporation
Honorable Cecil Underwood, President, Morgantown Industrial Park, Inc.
Mr. David L. Wagner, Vice President & Treasurer, Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation
Mr. William Watson, President, West Virginia Board of Regents
Honorable Howard L. Wellman, Member, House Education Committee, Twentieth District
Mr. Richard W. Wilkinson, President, First National Bank of Bluefield
Honorable Bruce O. Williams, Member, Senate Education Committee, Ninth District
Mr. William G. Williams, Jr., President, West Virginia Business Forms, Inc.
Honorable Tony E. Whitlow, Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, Tenth District
Honorable Albert D. Yanni, Member, House Education Committee, Fourth District

WEST VIRGINIA ROUNDTABLE STAFF

Ms. Madeleine B. Hemmings, President
Ms. Kathleen Steska, Administrative Assistant
Ms. Caroline Carpenter (on loan), Economic Development Representative, Monongahela Power Company

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STAFF

Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, President
Ms. Sharon L. Franz, Vice President and Director, School Services Division
Ms. Melody Brooks, Executive Assistant, School Services Division

WEST VIRGINIA EDUCATION FUND STAFF

Ms. Vivian Kidd, Executive Director

M. BOOTH ASSOCIATES STAFF (Publicity)

Ms. Margaret Booth, President
Mr. Patrick Taylor, Account Executive

Appendix B
Program

The Economic Development of West Virginia Through Education

Wednesday, August 6, 1986

10:30-1:00 pm REGISTRATION

12:30 pm LUNCHEON
Crystal Room

GREETINGS
Thomas C. Burns, Chairman
West Virginia Roundtable, Inc.

GOALS OF THE SYMPOSIUM
Honorable Hulett C. Smith
Former Governor of West Virginia
Chairman, Roundtable Task Force on Education

2:00 pm FIRST SYMPOSIUM
Chesapeake Hall

CHAIRMAN
Hulett C. Smith

SPEAKERS
Owen B. Butler
Chairman of the Board (Ret.), Proctor and Gamble Co.; Chairman, Subcommittee on Business and Schools, Committee for Economic Development

TOPIC
Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools

Lewis Branscomb
Vice President and Chief Scientist
International Business Machines Corp.;
Chairman, Carnegie Corporation Task Force on
Teaching as a Profession

TOPIC
A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century

Winfred Godwin
President, Southern Regional Education Board

TOPIC
What a State Can Do to Improve Education

DISCUSSION

6:00 pm RECEPTION
Ballroom

7:30 pm DINNER
Chesapeake Hall

CHAIRMAN
Hulett C. Smith

SPEAKER
The Honorable Arch A. Moore, Jr.
Governor of West Virginia

Thursday, August 7, 1986

9:00 am SECOND SYMPOSIUM
Chesapeake Hall

CHAIRMAN
Hulett C. Smith

SPEAKERS
Dennis P. Doyle
Hudson Institute
Co-author, *Excellence in Education*

TOPIC
Current State Efforts to Improve Education

Edward Fiske
Education Editor, *The New York Times*

TOPIC
The Press and Education Reform

Robert Schwartz
Special Assistant to the Governor
for Educational Affairs,
State of Massachusetts

TOPIC
Relationship of the Public Schools to Business

DISCUSSION

12:30 pm LUNCHEON
Crystal Room

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
Hulett C. Smith

ADJOURNMENT
Thomas C. Burns